Laurel Hill Cemetery
3822 Ridge Avenue
Philadelphia
Philadelphia County
Pennsylvania

HABS No. PA-1811

PHOTOGRAPHS

Historic American Buildings Survey
National Park Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240

ADDENDUM TO
LAUREL HILL CEMETERY
3822 Ridge ~~Road~~ Avenue, Fairmount Park
Philadelphia
Philadelphia
Pennsylvania

HABS No. PA-1811

HABS
PA
51-PHILA,
100-

WRITTEN HISTORICAL & DESCRIPTIVE DATA
PHOTOGRAPHS

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of Interior
1849 C Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20240

HABS
PA
51-PHILA
100-

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

ADDENDUM TO
LAUREL HILL CEMETERY

HABS No. PA-1811

Location: 3822 Ridge Avenue, Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania

Present Owner: Laurel Hill Cemetery Company

Present Use: Cemetery

Significance: Philadelphia's Laurel Hill Cemetery constitutes the second major rural cemetery in the United States. Begun in 1836, it is the earliest known work of John Notman, an important nineteenth-century architect and landscape designer. Civil engineer and "rural architect" James C. Sidney also forged his landscape career at Laurel Hill. After laying out a southern addition to the grounds, he designed parks and cemeteries in Pennsylvania and New York. A third beneficiary of Laurel Hill was its principal founder, John Jay Smith. He guided the cemetery's planting and promotion, and in the process earned an influential voice in horticulture and cemetery management. As the common link between people who shaped America's metropolitan landscape, Laurel Hill deserves study.

Yet the cemetery's significance extends well beyond an association with these individuals. In an era when cities suffered from crowding, disease, and scarcity of public space, Laurel Hill offered an "alternative environment." Amid clerical criticism and economic instability, the institution lured startling numbers of patrons and visitors. They came to experience artfully controlled nature; to see romantic monuments and to build them; to mix piety and patriotism, education and entertainment. Cemetery literature promised all of these things. Nonetheless, the institution ultimately placed property rights above public access. As Laurel Hill's visitation statistics fueled the Victorian crusade for urban parks, lot-holders built higher fences and mangers wrote more restrictive rules. Today Laurel Hill stands as a landmark in the history of American architecture, landscape, and marketing. Spawned by a New Jersey Quaker's interest in horticulture, commemoration, and elite enterprise, it is an essay in Victorian taste and mores.

Historian: Aaron V. Wunsch, HABS Historian, 1999

PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Historical Description (overview):

Laurel Hill Cemetery occupies a rolling, 74-acre tract in northwestern Philadelphia, near the city's East Falls neighborhood. The site overlooks the Schuylkill River and rises as much as 120 feet above the water, affording panoramic views of the opposite bank. Originally chosen for its picturesque effect, this location now helps buffer the cemetery from its noisy western border, Kelly Drive. Laurel Hill grew to its present size through the combination of four land parcels between 1836 and 1861. Because the design treatment, topography and prior use of these parcels differed, each phase of development remains clearly legible on the landscape.

A system of winding roads and paths provides access to the cemetery's 51 sections, guiding visitors past hundreds of mausoleums and monuments. These vary greatly in size and style, displaying the new republic's interest in classical and Egyptian iconography, the Victorian passion for opulence and eclecticism, and the early twentieth century's taste for L'Art Nouveau and more restrained revivalism. On Ridge Avenue near Clearfield Street, a Roman Doric gate house (1836), marks the cemetery's main entrance and gives passersby a glimpse of the sculpture group *Old Mortality* (1836). Iron gates on sandstone piers (1849) are located at the site's southeastern corner and once served as a secondary entrance. Near the bridge (1864) that joins Laurel Hill's central and southern sectors stands a Doric receiving tomb built of terra cotta (1913). The only building postdating the receiving tomb is a mid-twentieth-century garage situated near the center of the cemetery's eastern edge. Despite the addition of this structure, the loss of others, and the disappearance of early plantings, Laurel Hill retains much of its integrity. Entrances, walls, monuments and ground plan remain intact, constituting crucial elements in one of the nation's first rural cemeteries.

B. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Origins of the Rural Cemetery Movement

In late 1835, John Jay Smith (1798-1881) took preliminary steps toward establishing a large, landscaped cemetery outside Philadelphia.[1] Born of a Quaker family with deep roots in the Delaware Valley, Smith was an editor and aspiring man of letters who served as Librarian at the city's Library Company.[2] He claimed that his interest in providing Philadelphia with an institution then known as a "rural cemetery" stemmed from a sense of civic duty and, more directly, from an unpleasant personal experience. At the beginning of his diary he recounted:

> The City of Philadelphia has been increasing so rapidly of late years that the living population has multiplied beyond the means of accommodation for the dead, a circumstance which has forcibly impressed my mind, and in connection with the fact that on recently visiting Friends grave yard in [sic] Cherry Street I found it impossible to designate the resting place of a darling daughter, determined me to endeavor to procure for the citizens a suitable, neat and orderly location for a rural cemetery, where each individual or family might have a lot in fee simple to bury their dead.[3]

As Smith attested, Philadelphia was growing and its graveyards becoming more crowded. His daughter's unmarked grave accorded with Quaker burial practice and could hardly have surprised him, but his objections did not end here. The grave site had also been partially flooded at the

---

[1]The standard account of Laurel Hill Cemetery's early history appears in Constance M. Greiff, *John Notman, Architect* (Philadelphia: Athenaeum of Philadelphia, 1979), 18-19, 53-60. See also Colleen McDannell, "The Religious Symbolism of Laurel Hill Cemetery," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 111, no. 3 (July 1987): 275-303. On Smith, see J. Thomas Scharf and Thompson Westcott, *History of Philadelphia, 1609-1884* (Philadelphia: L. H. Everts & Co., 1884), 2: 1183-84 and John Jay Smith, *Recollections of John Jay Smith* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1892), passim.

[2]Smith's appointment at the Library Company (1829-1851) made him chief executive officer of one of the nation's earliest and most important private libraries. The institution's holdings exceeded 55,000 volumes by 1855 - a collection rivaled only by Harvard's. George B. Tatum, *Penn's Great Town* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961): 162.

[3]John Jay Smith, "Memoranda Respecting the Foundation of Laurel Hill Cemetery," [8 November 1835], as transcribed in the personal notes of David Schuyler, Professor of American Studies at Franklin and Marshall College. Smith apparently intended his Memoranda to serve as a semi-public document and it was being quoted by the author of a popular magazine as early as 1844; see John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 102-03, 268 and "Laurel Hill," *Godey's Lady's Book* 28, no. 10 (March 1844): 107-08. Available to researchers through the late 1970s, this crucial document was lost during the following decade; see McDannell, 275. I am indebted to Dr. Schuyler for making his notes available to me.

time of interment and memory of this image further strengthened his resolve to create an alternative place of sepulture. Toward this end, he contacted former Philadelphia Mayor Benjamin W. Richards who, in turn, mentioned Smith's idea to "several public spirited citizens." Smith then arranged a meeting with druggist Frederick Brown, merchant Nathan Dunn, architect William Strickland, lawyer Thomas I. Wharton and Richards to consider launching the cemetery venture. They convened on November 14 and, at Strickland's suggestion, were joined by marble mason John Struthers. Wharton soon indicated he wanted no part in the project and Struthers remained a bystander, but the others joined Smith and pressed forward with cemetery plans. Dunn was to serve as Chairman and Smith as Secretary.[4]

After discussing the need for "a Rural Cemetery calculated to be convenient and ornamental within a reasonable distance of Philadelphia," the partners considered the question of location. Initially they favored The Woodlands, a lavishly landscaped estate located in what is now West Philadelphia.[5] Several weeks later Smith reported that this site was unavailable. The search resumed. Another property near Girard College proved "too near the city" and "too level for picturesque effect." Finally, in February, 1836, a satisfactory alternative appeared. Nathan Dunn paid $15,200 for Laurel Hill, the former estate of Joseph Sims. The tract lay three-and-one-half miles north of downtown Philadelphia and straddled one of the city's early turnpikes. In order to reimburse Dunn and underwrite construction, the group established the Laurel Hill Cemetery Company, initially hoping to sell stock in it. They further decided to seek an Act of Incorporation for their enterprise from the Pennsylvania legislature.[6]

The institution that Smith and his colleagues founded in 1836 was the first of its kind in Philadelphia and among the first in the nation. Its novelty lay in the combination of three major elements: a location well outside the city, a site chosen for its picturesque potential and an administration that bore no religious affiliation. Yet local, national and international precedent existed for each of these elements in varying degrees.

---

[4]Greiff, *John Notman*, 55; "Laurel Hill," *Godey's*, 107; Minutes of the Managers of Laurel Hill Cemetery Company, TD, 14 November 1835, Laurel Hill Cemetery Company collection, (minutes cited hereafter as LHC minutes, and collection as LHC).

[5]Of all Philadelphia-area estates, The Woodlands came closest to meeting English landscape gardening ideals of the late eighteenth century. Strickland had surveyed the property in 1809, Smith had admired it since childhood, and their opinions presumably influenced the site selection process. See below, and Timothy Preston Long, "The Woodlands: A 'Matchless Place'" (M.S. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1991), 195-96.

[6]LHC minutes, 14, 23 November 1835, 1 March 1836; Constance M. Greiff, "John Notman and Laurel Hill" in Reed Laurence Engle and Constance M. Greiff, "Historic Structure Report, Laurel Hill Cemetery, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1979" TMs [photocopy], p. 4-5, located at LHC and cited hereafter as HSR; Philadelphia County Deed Book A.M. 73, p. 194 (26 February 1836). Smith, Richards, Brown and Dunn did not bear equal legal title to the property until 1839 when all four were named trustees; Philadelphia County Deed Book G.S. 1, pp. 460, 463 (30 May 1839).

Starting in the mid eighteenth century, Europeans began to rethink the traditional relationships between cities and institutions such as graveyards, hospitals and prisons. Scientific and medical studies suggested that these concentrations of human life and death contributed significantly to the spread of airborne disease through their proximity to the urban populace. Churchyards and municipal graveyards were a particular target of Enlightenment-era reform efforts. Their foul-smelling atmosphere or "miasma" was a source of great concern while the established practice of burying all but the very wealthy in collective graves and subjecting them to periodic re-interment began to strike contemporaries as undignified and distasteful.[7]

Many literate American urbanites were aware of these currents in European reform and confronted similar problems at home. While cities in the New World were newer and smaller than their Old-World counterparts, they too contained crowded graveyards and suffered from epidemics. New Haven was a case in point. During the early 1790s the city experienced repeated bouts of yellow fever. Public attention began to focus on the over-filled burial ground behind the town's meeting house, and in 1796 a group of wealthy citizens rallied around statesman James Hillhouse to found the New Haven Burying Ground. This unprecedented institution operated as a private, non-sectarian corporation. Free from church and municipal oversight, it was controlled instead by families that purchased burial lots. It offered sepulchral security, lay far enough from town to avoid being perceived as a health risk and occupied a placid, orderly site adorned with poplar and willow trees.[8]

The New Haven Burying Ground was laid out on a grid plan and its horticultural embellishments were minor. Only indirectly did the design acknowledge the principles of English picturesque landscape gardening that had gained currency in Europe and America earlier in the century. On private English estates, Alexander Pope, William Shenstone, Henry Hoare and others had sought to evoke the Arcadia described by Virgil and depicted by Poussin. Here controlled nature became strongly associated with mourning and commemoration: "The memorial and even the tomb were as integral a feature of these gardens as were the winding path and the ha-ha."[9] This school of landscape treatment and others that grew out of it exerted widespread influence on the design of estates and private parks after 1750. By the 1780s, proposals for cemeteries informed

---

[7]Richard A. Etlin, "Landscapes of Eternity: Funerary Architecture and the Cemetery, 1793-1881," *Oppositions* 8 (Spring 1977): 15, 18; idem, "Pere Lachaise and the Garden Cemetery," *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (July-September 1984): 211, 213; David C. Sloane, *The Last Great Necessity: Cemeteries in American History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press), 28-29.

[8]Stanley French, "The Cemetery as Cultural Institution: The Establishment of Mount Auburn and the 'Rural Cemetery' Movement," *American Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (March 1974): 43; David Schuyler, "The Evolution of the Anglo-American Rural Cemetery: Landscape Architecture as Social and Cultural History," *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (July-September 1984): 292-94; Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 29-34.

[9]Etlin, "Pere Lachaise," 214-17; see also James Stevens Curl, "The Design of the Early British Cemeteries," *Journal of Garden History*, 4, no. 3 (July-September 1984): 226.

by the picturesque aesthetic began to surface in France. However, it was not until 1804, with the advent of Paris' Pere Lachaise, that a true garden cemetery came into being.

The opening of Pere Lachaise was a watershed in the history of landscape architecture and urbanism. Set off from the city, the new cemetery came as genteel response to decades of French pleas for extramural burial. Now, for the first time, the arcadian ideal thoroughly shaped the design of a graveyard. Architect Alexandre-Theodore Brongniart transformed the grounds of a hilltop estate into a semi-wooded "park" with dramatic views of Paris. A curving drive unified the formal and informal components of the design, guiding visitors past diminutive classical monuments and through a sequence of carefully-constructed vistas.[10]

Over the next three decades, Pere Lachaise became an international tourist destination, prompting cities outside France to consider it a model. The entrenched tradition of churchyard burial initially checked the spread of similar developments in America and Great Britain. But recurring epidemics and other problems associated with inner-city burial broke down this resistance. Advocates of extramural cemeteries organized in the two countries during the 1820s and eventually turned their attention to Pere Lachaise. In 1831, London's Kensal Green and Boston's Mount Auburn cemeteries both took their cue from Brongniart's creation.[11]

Americans coined the phrase "rural cemetery" to describe the type of development Mount Auburn inaugurated in their country. Advanced by Jacob Bigelow and the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, Mount Auburn joined the Romantic landscaping of Pere Lachaise to an administrative structure like the New Haven Burying Ground's. The cemetery occupied a wooded lot along the Charles River, several miles from Boston, and its layout represented an attempt to augment natural beauty with art and science. Roads and paths fitted the site's varied topography, a design solution that was at once economical, accessible and picturesque. Monuments, plantings and the overall plan were to serve as lessons in art, history, botany and taste. Members of the Horticultural Society even arranged for the inclusion of "experimental gardens." While Mount Auburn was a metropolitan institution, it provided a "soothing" alternative to the city. Contagion, commerce and the regimentation of the urban grid lay well outside its borders.[12]

---

[10]Etlin, "Pere Lachaise," 211, 219; Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 49.

[11]French, 42-43; Schuyler, "Evolution," 291-95, 299-300. For an overview of garden cemetery development in Great Britain, see Curl, "Early British Cemeteries," and idem, *The Victorian Celebration of Death* (Detroit: Partridge Press, 1972); pages 55-57 cover the founding of Kensal Green.

[12]French, 44-52; Schuyler, "Evolution," 295, 303; Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 44-47, 65, 75-76; Thomas Bender, "The 'Rural' Cemetery Movement: Urban Travail and the Appeal of Nature," *New England Quarterly* 47 (June 1974): 198, 202; Barbara Rotundo, "Mount Auburn: Fortunate Coincidences and an Ideal Solution," *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (July-September 1984): 264.

The Garden of Retreat and Reform

The dangers and discomforts of urban life confronting Bostonians in the early nineteenth century affected residents of other eastern seaboard cities more dramatically. Philadelphia's population grew from 42,000 in 1790 to 113,00 in 1820, and New York experienced a similar increase. The resultant crowding and sanitation problems in both cities lead to repeated bouts of yellow fever: Philadelphia was hit hard in 1793 and less forcefully in 1797 and 1798.[13]

At these times, affluent Philadelphians left their city *en masse*, often retreating to the surrounding countryside. While the scale of this exodus was unusually large, the pattern itself was not new. For decades the urban elite had escaped summer heat and disease by withdrawing to estates that lay several miles out of town. Concentrated along the banks of the Delaware and Schuylkill rivers, these "villas" and their idyllic surroundings did much to associate nature, health and wealth in the minds of Philadelphians.[14]

A pragmatic concern for human health was only one of several factors underlying the proliferation of country seats around Philadelphia during the second half of the eighteenth century. These estates also afforded the cultivated gentleman a venue for displaying his interest in architecture, botany and landscape design. By mid century, Quaker botanist John Bartram had gained international renown for the garden in which he attempted to simulate the natural habitats of his plants. Of greater artistic importance was William Hamilton's estate, The Woodlands. Hamilton was a well-traveled Anglophile. Like Bartram, he studied botany but he was also one of a growing number of Philadelphians who scrutinized developments in English landscape gardening after the Revolution. Under Hamilton's tenure, The Woodlands became the preeminent American example of the controlled naturalism promoted by Humphry Repton and his disciples on the other side of the Atlantic.[15]

For William Hamilton and most of his contemporaries, the scientific study of plants and plant-raising was a private and genteel pursuit. However, during the decades that followed the birth of

---

[13]Sam Bass Warner, Jr., *The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of Its Growth* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968), 103, 105; David E. Stannard, "Calm Dwellings: The Brief, Sentimental Age of the Rural Cemetery," *American Heritage* 30, no. 5 (August-September 1979): 44; Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 34-38.

[14]Carl and Jessica Bridenbaugh, *Rebels and Gentlemen: Philadelphia in the Age of Franklin* (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1942), 191; E. Digby Baltzell, *Philadelphia Gentleman: The Making of A National Upper Class* (New York: The Free Press, 1958), 174, 179; Roger W. Moss, *The American Country House* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1990), 4-6; Aaron Wunsch, "Schuylkill River Villas," Historic American Buildings Survey no. PA-6184 (1995), passim.

[15]Therese O'Malley, "Landscape Gardening in the Early National Period," in *Views and Visions: American Landscape before 1830*, ed. Edward J. Nygren and Bruce Robertson (Washington: Corcoran Gallery of Art, 1986), 133-35, 141-42; Long, 13-14, 37-53, 147-48.

the new republic, middle- and upper-class Americans grew increasingly interested in the social benefits of horticulture and scientific agriculture. Without losing all of their genteel connotations, these activities were increasingly equated with republican virtue and moral rectitude. They occupied more of peoples' leisure time and became the focus of new societies and associations.[16]

In this climate of civic consciousness, a number of public and semi-public institutions began exposing the urban populace to some of the benefits of "country life" enjoyed by the elite. Philadelphia saw the establishment of two small, landscaped public parks in the 1780s. One adjoined the State House and the other lay along the east bank of the Schuylkill near Gray's Ferry. A third park was established upriver in 1815, in conjunction with the Fairmount Waterworks. Housed in a villa-like structure, this engineering feat brought the urban masses an element which had long safeguarded villa-dwellers against yellow fever: fresh water. Some country seats on the Schuylkill also became more accessible to the public. Just north of the Waterworks lay Lemon Hill, an estate famed for its semi-formal gardens and greenhouse stocked with exotic plants. By the 1820s, owner Henry Pratt had opened the estate to sight-seers, whom he admitted via tickets. Across the river, William Hamilton had decided to try marketing the villa concept on a smaller, more affordable scale. Carving off a northern section of the Woodlands tract, he subdivided it with the intention of creating "Hamiltonville," one of the nation's earliest suburbs.[17]

Though small in scope and initially unsuccessful, Hamilton's scheme signaled the onset of massive demographic changes that were soon to reshape Philadelphia and other large American cities. By 1830, Philadelphia's population had jumped to 161,410. Urban real estate was becoming more expensive and open river frontage more desirable. As a result, the outskirts of the city began losing their rural character. The elite retreated still further from the urban core, their flight hastened, in some cases, by the 1821 completion of the Fairmount Dam which created stagnant water upstream. Gradually their estates were divided up for industrial, commercial and denser residential use, and a landscape once prized for its contrast to city life receded before a burgeoning metropolis.[18]

---

[16]Rotundo, "Fortunate Coincidences" 255-56; Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 46; Nicholas B. Wainwright, "The Age of Nicholas Biddle, 1825-1841," in *Philadelphia: A 300 Year History*, ed. Russell F. Weigley et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1982), 291.

[17]O'Malley, "Landscape Gardening," 145-49; Owen Tasker Robbins, "Toward a Preservation of the Grounds of Lemon Hill in Light of Their Past and Present Significance for Philadelphians" (M.S. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1987); Aaron Wunsch, "Lemon Hill," Historic American Buildings Survey no. PA-1010 (1995), passim. On places of outdoor recreation in 1830s Philadelphia, see *A Picture of Philadelphia, or, A Brief Account of the Various Institutions and Public Objects in this Metropolis* (Philadelphia: E.L. Carey and A. Hart, 1835), 145-48. Conceived in the 1800s, Hamiltonville remained largely undeveloped until the 1840s. See Long, 166-69, 177-78.

[18]Warner, 50-51; Long, 4-5; Wainwright, "The Age of Nicholas Biddle," 280-81.

Even as the villa landscape entered a period of decline, its earlier associations with sanctuary, sanitation and regeneration led the founders of charitable institutions to build large complexes in the same area. During the mid 1810s, members of the Society of Friends established an "Asylum for the Relief of Persons Deprived of the Use of their Reason" about five miles north of the city. "It was a home in the country, a fifty-two-acre farm in an area where many Philadelphia Quakers had summer homes."[19] Integral to the design were a picturesque botanical garden and working farm, intended to have a therapeutic effect on the patients. Over the next two decades, the same reform-minded optimism lead to the construction of Eastern State Penitentiary and the Preston Retreat (for poor, pregnant women) somewhat closer to the urban core. In 1832, completion of the Blockley Almshouse on a site near the Woodlands demonstrated West Philadelphia's suitability for such development. Work began on the Pennsylvania Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases, north of the almshouse, four years later. By then, the ex-urban landscape had become a venue for proving that carefully planned institutions could control the social disorder increasingly apparent in the New Republic's big cities.[20]

While the outskirts of Philadelphia felt the side effects of industrialization and population growth, the city itself bore the brunt. New stores and factories sprang up, and, without public transportation, workers had to find housing nearby. Soon buildings encroached on all empty lots including churchyards and public burial grounds. The dead, whose numbers rose with the population, now occupied valuable land that lay "in an unwelcome and offensive contiguity to the dwellings of the living."[21] Aware of the health risks posed by this predicament, City Councils moved in 1812 to ban all burial in Philadelphia's public squares. Though well intended, this decision prevented the newly deceased from being buried with the remains of their families in these areas.[22]

Other problems lingered too. In the words of one nineteenth-century historian:

---

[19]Nancy Gerlach-Spriggs, Richard Enoch Kaufman, and Sam Bass Warner, Jr., *Restorative Gardens: The Healing Landscape* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 109.

[20]David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971); Richard J. Webster, *Philadelphia Preserved* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976), 196-97, 212-13, 284-86, 308-09; Carl Beneson Perloff, *The Asylum* (Philadelphia: Friends Hospital, 1994), 14-15, 46-50; John F. Sears, *Sacred Places: American Tourist Attractions in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 89-95; Long, 179-82.

[21][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill Cemetery, Near Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: C. Sherman, 1844), 10.

[22]Scharf and Westcott, 3: 2357; Schuyler, "Evolution," 292-93. On early nineteenth-century burial conditions in Philadelphia and their supposed health risks, see John Elkinton, *The Monument Cemetery of Philadelphia, (Late De L'Amerique Pere la Chaise)* (Philadelphia: Rackliff and King, 1837), and "Atticus," *Hints on the Subject of Interments Within the City of Philadelphia: Addressed to the Serious Consideration of the Members of Councils, Commissioners of the Districts, and Citizens Generally* (Philadelphia: William Brown, 1838).

> The church burying-grounds or the Potter's Field were the only places of interment. The families of persons who did not belong to religious congregations were at great disadvantage on the occasion of their death, or if there was no difficulty on this account the charges for opening the ground and permitting the burial were heavy. Besides, there was no property in a grave, and it became necessary in course of time to dig new graves exactly where old ones had been situate.[23]

By the mid 1820s, Philadelphians started forming private, non-profit burial associations to address this crisis. The earliest such group was the Mutual Burying-Ground Society of the City and County of Philadelphia. In 1826, the Society purchased ground on Washington Avenue near Tenth Street and established a non-profit "family cemetery." Lots measuring eight by ten feet sold for ten dollars, without regard for "differences of religious tenets." In the interest of equality, members of the society received no more than one lot apiece, distributed through a ballot system.[24]

More lavish (and profitable) was the Philadelphia Cemetery that Scottish typefounder James Ronaldson laid out the following year. Employing a design like New Haven Burying Ground's, Ronaldson adorned a square plot at Ninth and Shippen (now Bainbridge) Streets with "gravel walks" and "various trees and shrubs." An entrance gate flanked by a "House for Bier" and "Keeper's House" confronted visitors, while the gridded lots within - no bigger than those at Mutual - cost up to thirty dollars. At first this venture remained an anomaly in Philadelphia. Four other cemeteries of the same era conformed essentially to the Mutual or "associate" model.[25]

For all their administrative novelty, Mutual and Philadelphia cemeteries were still in and of the city. When John Jay Smith conceived Laurel Hill, he envisioned something fundamentally different. Like the associate cemeteries and Ronaldson's, Laurel Hill was non-sectarian. Again

---

[23]Scharf and Westcott, 1: 620; see also "A Rural Cemetery for Philadelphia," as reprinted in *Waldie's Port Folio, and Companion to the Select Circulating Library*, pt. 1, no. 12 (4 June 1836): 191. Brief histories of Philadelphia's burial grounds before 1825 appear in idem, 1: 619-20, 3: 2355-59; R. A. Smith, *Illustrated Guide*, 24-26; John F. Watson, *Annals of Philadelphia, and Pennsylvania, in the Olden Time,* ed. Willis P. Hazard (Philadelphia: Leary, Stuart Co., 1927), 3: 136-37, 139-40.

[24]*Preamble to and Constitution of the Mutual Family Burying Ground Association, of the City and County of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: [n. p.], 1827); Scharf and Westcott, 1: 620.

[25]*Philadelphia Cemetery; Copy of the Deeds of Trust, Charter, By-Laws and List of Lot-Holders; with an Account of the Cemetery* (Philadelphia: Mifflin and Parry, 1845); Scharf and Westcott, 1: 620, 3: 2359; Watson, *Annals* (1927 ed.), 3: 137; Gordon M. Marshall III, "James Ronaldson," in *Philadelphia: Three Centuries of American Art* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1976), 238.

following Ronaldson, Smith and his colleagues created a private lot-sales company (by 1837, plans to sell stock were off, but so were non-profit appearances).[26] However, unlike any local predecessors, Laurel Hill was "rural" - of the city but in the country. It was, first and foremost, a garden of the dead in the landscape of aristocratic retreat.

Most scholars justly interpret Laurel Hill as a case of Philadelphia emulating Boston. Smith certainly drew inspiration from Mount Auburn, where the combination of extra-mural burial, romantic landscaping and horticultural gardening was being tested. A cultivated urbanite with gentlemanly ambitions, he shared with Mount Auburn's founders a broad philosophy on the roles of history, art and nature in the New Republic. Moreover, few Americans of Smith's background or position could ignore the great interest that Mount Auburn generated. The Boston institution set the standards for future rural cemetery development, and Laurel Hill's founders' search for a site like that on the banks of the Charles was predictable enough.[27]

Yet Laurel Hill was also a product of its place. Rejecting contemporary Philadelphian burial practice, Smith turned to the city's private gardening traditions. As a child, he had frequently visited the Schuylkill River estates of Bartram, Hamilton and Pratt. Here, he later recalled, he had "imbibed that love of trees and flowers which has afforded me so much pleasure."[28] This regard for the regional birthplaces of horticulture and landscape design underlay the initial preference for Hamilton's Woodlands which Smith shared with the other founders. Their ultimate choice of the Sims estate stemmed from the same interest. Unlike Mount Auburn, then, Laurel Hill was a private garden put to semi-public use. If there was an important non-local

---

[26]In 1836, there were three established models for the financial structure of a secular cemetery. One was the non-profit corporation in which lot holders were also shareholders; New Haven Burying Ground set this precedent nationally, and Mutual had adopted it locally. An overtly capitalist alternative was the joint stock company that ran certain English cemeteries. Mount Auburn had begun to straddle the line between these two arrangements, but Ronaldson presented a third. His Philadelphia Cemetery sold lots in fee simple and vested overall ownership in the hands of a few trustees. Like Mount Auburn, Laurel Hill initially leaned toward the first two options: the founders wished to sell stock but also receive non-profit status. However, Dunn's decision to purchase the grounds outright obviated the immediate need for offering stock, and the state legislature showed no interest in granting tax exemption. By 1839, Laurel Hill had fully implemented the Ronaldson plan. See Scharf and Westcott, 1: 620; French, 43, 45; Rotundo, "Mount Auburn Cemetery: A Proper Boston Institution," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 22, no. 3 (July 1974): 271; idem, "Fortunate Coincidences," 257-58; Robert W. Torchia, "No Strangers to the Ravages of Death: John Neagle's Portrait of Dr. John Abraham Elkinton," *Nineteenth Century* 18, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 15-16; Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 31-32, 59, 131.

[27]Blanche Linden-Ward, Bigelow and Dearborn entries in *Pioneers of American Landscape Design*, eds. Charles Birnbaum and Lisa Crowder (Washington: U. S. Department of the Interior, 1993), 14-18, 40-42. After 1832, the circumstances of Mount Auburn's birth became conventions of rural cemetery establishment. A large number or rural cemeteries were, for instance, founded by horticultural society members and located on the banks of rivers for maximum picturesque effect. See Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 73-74, 76; Schuyler, "Evolution," 295-97.

[28]John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 274-75, 294. In these pages Smith evinces childhood familiarity with the Sedgeley estate, located between Lemon Hill and the future site of Laurel Hill Cemetery.

influence on site selection, it was Pere Lachaise, which Benjamin Richards had visited and admired.[29]

The synthesis of picturesque estate and reform-minded institution was also in keeping with Smith's background. An old-line Quaker from the Philadelphia area, he would have been aware of the Sims property's associations with the health-and-leisure-seeking patterns of the city's elite. No doubt he was also attuned to the newer trend whereby charitable institutions, often connected to the Society of Friends, sought out "rural" sites as part of a larger program of reform and regeneration. In his journal, Smith professed determination to improve burial conditions in Philadelphia. By helping guide Laurel Hill's founders to the Sims tract, he placed the cemetery in line with the city's penitentiary, almshouse and insane asylum.[30]

Design and Construction, Phase I

The land Nathan Dunn purchased for the Cemetery Company had evolved in a manner typical along the southern reaches of the Schuylkill River. Between 1797 and 1824, the thirty-two-acre parcel had been the country seat of merchant Joseph Sims. Known as Laurel Hill, or simply Laurel, it included a porticoed Georgian mansion and several large outbuildings, all of indeterminate date.[31] Sims' estate lay along the Ridge Road, one of two main arteries running northwest from Philadelphia. In 1812, the road re-opened as a privately maintained turnpike.[32] Both Sims and the turnpike company encountered financial trouble in the following decade, and after 1824 Laurel Hill changed hands repeatedly. During the early 1830s its was rented out, first as a farm and tavern, then as a boarding school. With each change in function, the site took on

---

[29]Henry Simpson, "Benjamin W. Richards," in *The Lives of Eminent Philadelphians, Now Deceased* (Philadelphia: William Brotherhead, 1859), 840-42. Simpson describes Richards as a vocal proponent of urban burial reform and implies Richards' initiatives (as much as Smith's) led to the founding of Laurel Hill.

[30]On the relationship between rural cemeteries and other early-nineteenth-century, extra-urban institutions of reform, see Sears, 102, and Kenneth L. Ames, "Ideologies in Stone: Meanings in Victorian Gravestones," *Journal of Popular Culture* 14, no. 4 (Spring 1981): 642, 651.

[31]The property had belonged to Mounce Justice and his heirs throughout much of the eighteenth century. When Sims took title, the estate included a "Mansion House, Farm House, Barns, Stables, Garden, Orchard, [and] Meadows" but had been shorn of the land required to operate a profitable farm (Philadelphia County Deed Book no. 69, p. 28 [23 November 1797]). In 1803, Sims took out Mutual Assurance policies on five buildings "near the Falls of Schuylkill" (policy nos. 1673-75, 1689, 1708, at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, cited hereafter as HSP). The mansion, farm house and several outbuildings he insured may well have been those he acquired in 1797. John Hills' *Plan of the City of Philadelphia and Environs* (1809) identifies the tract as "Sims Laurel," but deeds refer to "Laurel Hill" by 1831. An indistinct early view of the site appears in William Birch, *The Country Seats of the United States of North America* (Springfield [PA], 1808), in the background of plate 15 ("Mendenghall Ferry").

[32]Donald C. Jackson, "Roads Most Traveled: Turnpikes in Southeastern Pennsylvania in the Early Republic," in *Early American Technology: Making and Doing Things from the Colonial Era to 1850*, ed. Judith A. McGaw (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 224, 232-33, 235.

an increasingly public character, ultimately becoming a sort of "popular pleasure ground." In 1834, Reverend Jeremiah Keily began operating Laurel Hill College, a Catholic boys school, on the premises. A room in the mansion apparently served as the school chapel. Keily's venture was short-lived. Soon he was forced to sell to two other priests, and it was these men whom cemetery backers approached in early 1836.[33]

Despite these rapid transitions, the estate retained enough of its earlier character to suit the Cemetery Company's needs. In 1844, Smith provided Laurel Hill's visitors with a somewhat romanticized description of the place as he found it. He extolled the taste of Sims,

> ...who, fully appreciating [the tract's] many and remarkable beauties, had left the river front to the care of nature; it was covered with a fine growth of forest trees, only here and there intersected by paths; the rocks, which are piled in picturesque confusion on some portions near the Schuylkill, were undisturbed. The upland was planted by him with a few fine evergreens, ornamental shrubs, &c., and fruit trees..."[34]

Here was a landscape brought by nature and design into conformity with the rural cemetery movement's ideals. Laurel Hill's managers approached the task of adaptation carefully. Just as they had departed from Mount Auburn precedent in obtaining a designed landscape, they took another ambitious step in selecting a professionally trained architect to lay out the cemetery grounds. The two individuals generally credited with conceiving Mount Auburn's buildings and plan are Jacob Bigelow and Henry A. S. Dearborn. Their knowledge of horticulture was thorough, but their forays into architecture and landscape gardening were essentially gentlemanly. Whatever such skills Smith and his fellow managers possessed, they decided that the design of Laurel Hill should be left to someone else. Between May and June, 1836, they accepted proposals from at least three architects.

The competition appears to have been informal. No record of a public announcement has surfaced, and the only signed entries to survive are those of William Strickland and Thomas U. Walter.[35] Both schemes employ Egyptian Revival gateways, apparently derived from Mount

---

[33]A. C. Chadwick, East Falls, Pennsylvania, to Stuart Hunt, Laurel Hill Cemetery, ALS, 17 June 1931, at LHC. See also lease between Laurel Hill owner John M. Melizet and tavern keeper John S. Brown, AMsS, 28 February 1832; lease between John M. Melizet and boarding school operator Charles Julius Hadermann, AMsS, 21 September 1833; title abstract for Laurel Hill Cemetery and assorted deeds, at LHC. John Jay Smith alludes to the site's history in his Memoranda, 2-3, as quoted in HSR, 4-5.

[34][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 12. Smith did not know or failed to mention that the site's western slope had served as a quarry during the early 1830s; see above cited leases.

[35]Both design proposals are located in the collection of the Library Company of Philadelphia.

Auburn's. In each case, one-story pavilions flank an impressive pylon bearing a winged globe in the entablature. Strickland added flair to the arrangement by terminating it with a pair of fifty-foot-tall obelisks.

More idiosyncratic suggestions came forth for treating the landscape. Cemetery Company managers seem to have provided competition participants with a survey map of Sims' estate. Using this document as his starting point, Strickland moved to formalize the grounds. Complete and fragmentary ellipses served as the basis for a path system that found focus in front of the mansion. The design's axis related not to an earlier drive or the proposed entrance but to the orientation of the house. While transforming the tract's rocky western slopes into terraced "amphitheaters" (sic), Strickland was careful to maintain traces of artifice that predate his design. The original drive, lined with locust, laurel, cedar and ash trees, became a major walk, the southern extension of which may indicate the location of another old road. Buildings shown on the survey remained integral features as well.[36]

Comparisons between this site plan and an unsigned one sometimes credited to Walter are problematic. The latter is a crudely picturesque composition. Like Strickland's proposal, it is drawn directly on the survey map, but with little regard for existing architecture or topography. A tangled web of snaking paths, it is unlikely to be the work of Walter, a landscape gardener's pupil.[37]

The odds of the competition were stacked distinctly in Strickland's and Walter's favor. Strickland had helped found the cemetery company, Walter may have been acquainted with Smith, and both architects were at the forefront of their field by the mid 1830s.[38] But in the end, credentials counted little. Instead, the commission went to recent immigrant and relative novice John Notman (1810-1865). Born in Scotland, Notman had trained in Edinburgh, first as a builder, then as an architect. He crossed the Atlantic in late 1831, settling in Philadelphia and apparently making his living as a carpenter. How he came to the attention of Smith or Laurel Hill's other backers remains unclear. His work for the cemetery company constitutes his first known commission, and it effectively marked the start of his architectural career in the New

---

[36]HSR, 7, 44-45.

[37]Roger W. Moss and Sandra L. Tatman, *Biographical Dictionary of Philadelphia Architects: 1700-1930* (Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1985), 821. Though Walter may not have been the plan's author, his Account Book confirms that he supplied both gatehouse and landscape designs for Laurel Hill in May, 1836; see HSR, 7.

[38]As evidence of an 1830s friendship between Smith and Walter, Greiff cites the architect's design for Smith's house (1849) and a publication which the two men coauthored (1846); HSR, 13. Since both works postdate the cemetery competition, the argument is shaky. Whether or not Walter had an "inside advantage" in the competition, his designs for Moyamensing Prison (1831) and Girard College's Founder's Hall (1833) had already established his local and national reputation. Strickland had made his name earlier as architect of the Second Bank of the U. S. (1818), the U. S. Mint (1829) and Philadelphia's Merchant Exchange (1832).

World.[39]

To date, researchers have located only one of Notman's original drawings for Laurel Hill. Nonetheless, much information about his design may be gleaned from insurance records, published illustrations, and a large copper-plate engraving that was updated periodically during the cemetery's early years.[40] These sources indicate the presence of seven major buildings on the site between 1836 and 1839. In some cases, it is difficult to differentiate between structures extant at the time of Dunn's purchase, those specified in the competition program and those conceived entirely by Notman. Whatever the case, Notman's main architectural contribution to Laurel Hill took three forms.

By far the grandest building was the cemetery's Roman Doric gatehouse. Modeled loosely on a triumphal arch, it contained porter's and gardener's "lodges," divided by a vaulted passageway. Grand porticoes adorned the east and west facades, and a balustrade encircled the roof. Above the entrance, a large urn announced the institution's funereal function. Colonnaded walls stretched north and south at street level, terminating in curves that seemed to embrace visitors. Although one scholar has likened the gatehouse to contemporary works of Philadelphia classicism, the building's Roman (rather than Greek) character made it, in fact, quite unusual for its day.[41] What precedent Notman drew upon is unclear. A likely source is the frontispiece of Philip Miller's *Gardeners Dictionary* (1735), depicting the Chelsea Physic Garden in London. Notman could obviously have learned of the site's appearance through other means, but many of the architectural elements synthesized in the gatehouse (colonnaded pavilion, exedra-like wall, great urns) appear here in a single, much-published view. Miller's book was still a standard reference for American gardeners in the early nineteenth century, and Smith had access to it at

---

[39]Greiff, 14-18; HSR, 1-2. Greiff asserts that a project for the Library Company predated the Laurel Hill commission and brought Notman into contact with Smith. Bryn Mawr College Professor Jeffrey A. Cohen has since set a considerably later date for the Library Company work; personal communication with the author, 13 January 1998.

[40]I. P. Hammond's engraving, "Plan of the Laurel Hill Cemetery near Philadelphia, Survey by Philip M. Price, 1836" probably comes closest to replicating Notman's competition entry. As noted in HSR, 46-53, the engraving was modified at least three times to reflect changing conditions at the site, but must not be understood as a literal record of these conditions at any given point (the gatehouse, for instance, was never built as shown). Prints from the engraving's various phases are located at the Library Company of Philadelphia (ca. 1836), the Philadelphia Atheneum (ca. 1837) and LHC (ca. 1845); the copper engraving plates are also at LHC. Other early plans and elevations of the site appear in J. C. Wild and J. R. Chevalier, *Views of Philadelphia and its Vicinity* (Philadelphia, 1838), [John Jay Smith], *Statues of Old Mortality and His Pony, and of Sir Walter Scott* (Philadelphia: A. Waldie, [1838]) and [Smith's] 1844 *Guide*. Franklin Fire Insurance Policy No. 1967, at HSP, contains plans and a thorough description of LHC buildings as of 20 December 1839.

[41]The reference is to McDannell, 289.

the Library Company of Philadelphia.[42]

Northeast of the Sims mansion, Notman placed the superintendent's house. Identified as a "cottage" on early plans, the structure consisted of a two-story, hip-roofed main block with a prominent veranda along the facade. To either side were one-story wings, projecting forward to form semi-hexagonal bays. The vaguely oriental exterior referenced the *cottage orne* which John Nash and other English architects had popularized in recent decades.[43] Such exotic treatment belied the building's conservative center-hall plan - a layout like that of the neighboring mansion.

Just south of the cottage stood a third Notman building - a virtual folly in the Gothic Revival mode. This was a one-story stone chapel, rectangular in plan and essentially symmetrical in elevation. When compared with later views, the architect's drawing shows that his facade was simplified somewhat during construction.[44] Yet most elements remained: a central door and four tall windows, capped by ogival arches and divided by octagonal towers. The latter pierced a foliated parapet, emerging above as crenellated spires. Inside was an undivided room, colorfully lit from the east by a stained glass window. A receiving tomb, used to hold remains prior to interment, adjoined the building's rear wall. Long the subject of learned debate, Notman's chapel design may represent a remodeling of an earlier structure. At present, the evidence supporting this conclusion is stronger than that refuting it.[45]

Completing Laurel Hill's architectural program were Sims' venerable villa, a greenhouse, a carriage house, and stables. Notman and the other competition entrants treated these buildings as

---

[42]The plate is reproduced and discussed in O'Malley, "Landscape Gardening," 132-33, 135. Edwin Wolf lists Miller's book in *The Library of James Logan of Philadelphia, 1674-1751* (Philadelphia: Library Company of Philadelphia, 1974), catalog no. 1353.

[43]Greiff, 20.

[44]Key sources on the chapel's appearance are Notman's undated elevation, located at the Philadelphia Atheneum; Franklin Survey no. 1967; two illustrations in [Smith's] 1844 *Guide*; and two photographs, one marked "about 1880," the other undated, at LHC. In HSR, 30, Greiff counters Phoebe Stanton's suggestion that Notman prepared more than one design for the building; see Stanton, *The Gothic Revival and American Church Architecture* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1968), 46.

[45]In support of the new construction thesis, Greiff quotes Smith's Memoranda and the above-cited letter from Chadwick to Hunt. Both sources refer to Father Keily's adaptation of the Sims mansion for chapel use; HSR, 28. However, this arrangement may simply have preceded construction of a free-standing, pre-cemetery chapel, as a description in the *United States Gazette*, 12 March 1836, would seem to suggest. Greiff further notes that a building occupying the chapel site on the competition base map, and marked "chapel" by Strickland, *could* be "part of the program required by the cemetery's board." Keith Morgan makes the opposite case in his masters thesis, "The Landscape Gardening of John Notman, 1810-1865," University of Delaware (1973), 26-27. His argument is strengthened by the fact that the footprint in question is hatched on the Hammond engraving, a treatment that appears to indicate pre-existing construction elsewhere in the image.

design preconditions, probably because cemetery management wished to make use of existing structures. While the set of architectural "footprints" repeated on competition drawings could also have designated sites for new construction, this is unlikely. The mansion, of course, was not new. Insurance records also suggest pre-1805 dates for the stables and carriage house, though Notman apparently Gothicized the latter. Little information exists on the greenhouse, but it too might well have been part of a gentleman's Schuylkill River estate.[46]

When it came to designing the cemetery's grounds, Notman apparently turned to Henry E. Kendall's winning (though unexecuted) proposal for Kensal Green Cemetery, near London.[47] Illustrations of Kendall's scheme had been available in pamphlet form since 1832. Notman is apt to have derived his inspiration from this source, and the debt is fairly obvious. In both plans, winding roads and paths traverse much of the site, converging near the center to form primary and secondary focal points. The major focus is geometrically divided circle, identified as the "Shrubbery" at Laurel Hill. Axially related to this formal feature is the lesser node, a building. Here Kendall placed a Gothic chapel that clearly influenced Notman's. Significantly, Notman used the corresponding location for the Sims mansion.

The Scotsman adjusted Kendall's conception to fit Laurel Hill in other ways as well. Kensal Green was over twice the size of the Philadelphia site. Notman compensated with a lighter, more intricate layout based on three scales of circulation.[48] The largest accommodated vehicular traffic and was reserved for the ovoid drive that ringed the middle of the cemetery. Paths of two different widths gave access to individual lots. Like Strickland, Notman also managed to work the property's old entrance road into his design.

Laurel Hill's founders had intentionally procured a landscaped estate for reuse as a cemetery. Equally important, though often under-emphasized, is the degree to which Notman conceived the cemetery as an estate garden. Late in the eighteenth century, Humphry Repton had questioned the application of unmitigated naturalism to English country seats. Rather than eradicating overt

---

[46]Buildings 1, 5 and 6 on the 1839 Franklin Fire Insurance survey are the mansion, carriage house and stables, respectively. The mansion is almost certainly the building Sims insured in 1803, through Mutual Assurance policy no. 1689, at HSP. Mutual Assurance policy nos. 1708 and 1675, also dating from 1803 and located at HSP, describe buildings that correspond, in general terms, with the carriage house and stables recorded on the Franklin survey. However, the latter specifically notes "Gothic" features on the stables - an attempt to make the structure match the chapel. The greenhouse appears on the Franklin survey and in Antonio Shindler's 1850s painting, *Laurel Hill Cemetery, Philadelphia,* M. and M. Karolik Collection, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. The first published description of Laurel Hill's program may be: "A Rural Cemetery for Philadelphia;" see fn. [22].

[47]Greiff, 19. On Kensall Green, see Curl, "Early British Cemeteries," 227-30, and idem, *Victorian Celebration*, 58-64. Notman's rivals in the Laurel Hill competition may also have looked to Kendall's design. A sketch of the Englishman's proposed entrance to Kensall Green appears at the bottom of the unsigned ("Walter") entry; HSR, 11.

[48]HSR, 54-55.

traces of human artifice, he suggested treating areas near the house as a "transition space" between art and nature. This idea, which Repton defended in practical and aesthetic terms, soon traveled across the Atlantic, shaping gardens at the Woodlands and other Schuylkill villas. Back in England, John Claudius Loudon further popularized and elaborated Repton's principles after 1800.[49] In 1836, Notman evinced his own familiarity with this tradition. His use of the formal Shrubbery and pragmatic incorporation of existing site features were both highly Reptonian. The result was a villa-garden cemetery that avoided the axes of Pere Lachaise while accepting the sinuous naturalism of Mount Auburn only in moderation. In later years, John Jay Smith drew clear distinctions between "wooded" cemeteries like Mount Auburn "garden" cemeteries like his own.[50]

Who designed Laurel Hill? The foregoing narrative implies a fairly straightforward answer, and Notman scholars have never seriously suggested otherwise. Yet hands other than the Scotsman's were at work in both the design and construction processes. Primary sources directly connect Notman only to the cemetery's architecture, and even here some uncertainties exist.[51]

In late June, 1836, a local newspaper announced, "There is now to be seen at the Exchange a very beautiful picture drawn by Mr. Walter, and designed by Mr. Notman, the architect, of the entrance adopted by the company to the new Rural Cemetery at Laurel Hill, near Philadelphia." Lest readers think Walter acted only as delineator, the following day's paper added, "...a plan [for the entrance], not entirely correct in its proportions, was handed to Mr. Walter, who, as a friend, politely agreed to remodel it...without giving an opinion of the merit of the plan."[52] Walter obviously had some involvement with the gatehouse, if not in conception then in presentation. His account books show he received substantial payment in return. At minimum, his drawing affected the way engraver I. P. Hammond depicted the entrance in the most formal record of the cemetery's early appearance.[53]

---

[49]On Repton, Loudon and their impact along the Schuylkill, see George F. Chadwick, *The Park and the Town: Public Landscape in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966), 22-23, 53, 56; O'Malley, "Landscape Gardening," 137-38, 141-43; Long, 41, 52-53.

[50]John Jay Smith, "Rural Cemeteries," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 6, (August 1856): 346.

[51]The source linking Notman most closely to Laurel Hill's landscape is a lithographed plan appearing in [Smith's] 1844 *Guide*. The illustration is based on a Notman drawing and clearly credits him as architect and delineator. Even this evidence is open to interpretation, because Notman's architectural contribution could have been limited to the buildings shown clearly in the plan. Laurel Hill's earliest financial record, entitled "Statement of cost of Real Estate and improvements..." does not specify what services Notman provided; he received his first payment, $168.12, on 3 December 1836.

[52]*Poulson's Daily Advertiser*, 30 June and 1 July 1836, as quoted in HSR, 12.

[53]HSR, 12-13. As Greiff notes, Walter charged $100 for the work on 25 May 1836. Although Walter's connection to Laurel Hill probably ended here, two hints to the contrary deserve mention. The "Statement of cost of

More layers of responsibility attended the creation of the ground plan. While Notman was most likely the guiding force, surveyor Philip M. Price later alluded to "the practical experience I had obtained in designing and laying out the Laurel Hill and Monument Cemeteries."[54] In time, one of William Strickland's "amphitheaters" also took shape on the site - though Notman's original proposal *might* have included the same feature. Then there was John Jay Smith, who materially affected the cemetery's appearance by personally undertaking the planting. All these men could fairly claim to have designed Laurel Hill in some sense. Notman probably established the basic circulation pattern while Price worked out the details and Smith adorned the whole.[55] In any case, such ambiguities of attribution were symptomatic of architecture's and landscape gardening's pre-professional status. Similar issues complicate the histories of other rural cemeteries.[56]

Laurel Hill's more powerful backers must have indicated their preference for Notman's scheme in the first two weeks of June, 1836. Knowing or anticipating their decision, William Strickland left the company by the 13th.[57] Remaining board members convened two days later to discuss "some improvements of a costly kind" envisioned by Nathan Dunn.[58] As Greiff notes, this occasion was probably a preview of the work displayed at the Philadelphia Exchange.

Cemetery construction was under way well before the design selection process drew to a close. Along with the other managers, Smith was intent on giving Laurel Hill a secure and distinct appearance (images crucial to the rural cemetery concept). Back in April, he had "contracted for a stone wall...to be placed along the entire front of the premises on the Ridge Road, and for a

---

Real Estate and improvements..." shows $150 paid to "T. W. Walters" on 26 January 1837. Equally noteworthy is Walter's later association with Glenwood Cemetery, which resembled Laurel Hill in plan; Moss and Tatman, 827.

[54]Report to the Managers of the Woodlands Cemetery Company, in Minutes of the Woodlands Cemetery Company of Philadelphia, AMs, 18 Fehruary 1843. Collection of Woodlands Cemetery Company, Philadelphia. I am grateful to Timothy P. Long of the National Park Service for hringing this quotation to my attention.

[55]The title of Strickland's competition entry, "Plan of the walks & avenues of Laurel Hill Cemetery," may well indicate the landscape design limits to which all entries adhered.

[56]Attribution has proven a major problem at Kensal Green and Mount Auhurn cemeteries. A formal design competition at Kensal Green seems to have pertained only to architecture, and even in this area the final result was an amalgam. No competition was held for Mount Auburn's design, but the scenario is just as convoluted. Gentleman architect Bigelow, horticultural society president Dearbom, and civil engineer Alexander Wadsworth all apparently had a hand in the process. See Curl, "Early British Cemeteries," 227-29; Rotundo, "Fortunate Coincidences," 265-66; Philip Pregill and Nancy Volkman, *Landscapes in History: Design and Planning in the Western Tradition* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1993), 395, 411(n. 1).

[57]LHC Minutes, 13 June 1836.

[58]John Jay Smith, Memoranda, as quoted in HSR, 11.

fence on the north and south sides."[59] In the coming months, this emphasis on inviolability was underscored by law. The cemetery company's charter stipulated "That no streets or roads shall hereafter be opened through the lands of the said corporation, occupied as a burial ground, except by & with consent of this corporation."[60]

Of the company's thirty two acres, only the twenty lying west of Ridge Turnpike were reserved for burial. This was the parcel which new walls and strict legislation protected. Despite some marshy areas, the other twelve acres were usable, and their proximity to the new institution made them prime for rental. Dunn was eager to recoup the vast sums he was spending to make Laurel Hill a success but was not about to endanger the long-term security of his investment by allowing overt traces of commerce or urbanity to encroach on the cemetery. Accordingly, he leased the land to florist John Sherwood under several stern provisions. Within a 12-month period, Sherwood was obliged to erect "an ornamental Cottage or house suited to the said ground, for the accommodation of his family and Laborers, and a hot or green house for the protection and cultivation of flowers and plants." Since Sherwood's "horticultural garden" was to compliment the cemetery both functionally and aesthetically, his rent was low. But his construction would have to be "ornamental and attractive" and occupy only the easternmost part of the property. Nothing should mar frontal views of Laurel Hill, least of all the trappings of the tourist trade. Dunn declared:

> John Sherwood also engages <u>not</u> to sell wines, Spirituous Liquors, Ice Cream, or refreshments of any kind, and not to keep any animals, statues, paintings or other things as shows for money; -- he engages <u>not</u> to obstruct the view of Laurel Hill or the entrance on approaching it (sic) by the summer Road, usually called the Lamb Tavern Road, either in erecting Buildings or the growing of Trees.[61]

---

[59]Ibid., 5. At the time of Strickland's departure, the grounds were "partially enclosed" (LHC minutes, 13 June 1836) but wall construction was still proceeding in Novemher; see Sidney George Fisher, *A Philadelphia Perspective: The Diary of Sidney George Fisher Covering the Years 1834-1871*, ed. Nicholas Wainwright (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1967), 10 (4 November 1836). On the role of security in the rural cemetery movement, see Rotundo, "Fortunate Coincidences," 259; French, 45.

[60][John Jay Smith], *Regulations of the Laurel Hill Cemetery Company, on the River Schuylkill, near Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: A. Waldie, 1837), 16. Smith was evidently pleased with this provision but noted that the impetus for it had come from state lawmakers rather than the hoard; Memoranda, 23 February 1837, as quoted in Schuyler notes.

[61]Lease hetween Nathan Dunn and John Sherwood, AMsS, 3 September 1836, at LHC. Charles Ellet's *Map of Philadelphia County* ("1839" but not puhlished until 1843) shows "Sherwood" on the property in question. Laurel Hill's charter reinforced the lease hy specifying that this area "be cultivated as garden, with convenient huildings."

While land east of Ridge Road fell under these zoning-like restrictions, survey work commenced on the cemetery grounds. Philip Price concentrated his early efforts on the layout of burial lots within the carriage drive and just southwest of it (Sections A through H).[62] His task must have been challenging, for Notman's picturesque plan fostered irregularity in the size and shape of lots. The same circumstance precluded a single lot price. Instead the company charged by the square foot: 75 cents within the Shrubbery, 50 cents elsewhere. By contemporary standards these prices were high indeed.[63] They meant that Laurel Hill's more expensive lots cost twice as much as their Philadelphia Cemetery counterparts and roughly three times as much as Mount Auburn's. Then there was an additional maintenance fee, a small burden for the clientele the managers hoped to attract. They did not have long to wait long. On October 19, 1836, the remains of a Quaker woman named Mercy Carlise filled Laurel Hill's first grave.[64]

Cemetery buildings began to take form in the summer of 1836. By late March of the following year, Smith was able to report, "...the carpenters are busy with the chapel and the front fence on top of the wall (which I wish now had been iron); ...plasterers are occupied on the cottage and entrance..." Road construction seems to have been proceeding as well.[65] Price's surveying yielded new lots to the south (Sections I and L) and Smith oversaw a massive planting campaign. Some 84 trees were already growing on the upland part of the property. As of 2 June 1837 Smith had added another 800 trees and shrubs. Mountain Laurel, Holly, Balm of Gilead (poplar) and Rhododendron were among the species he favored. The Shrubbery and an oval-shaped turnaround in front of the mansion were the logical locations for formal planting, and Notman apparently intended to keep both features free from burial. Smith acknowledged the Shrubbery's

---

[62]See Hammond engraving, first state. Price took payment for his work under the name of his firm, Fox and Price, Surveyors. Laurel Hill's "Statement of cost of Real Estate and improvement..." shows the first few payments occurred on 31 October 1836 ($200.00), 4 February 1837 ($200.00) and 20 February 1837 ($507.26).

[63]Perhaps by design, Laurel Hill's most expensive lots cost exactly twice as much as the best Philadelphia Cemetery lots and six times as much as any Mutual lot. Laurel Hill's prices were also high by national standards. A square foot of average burial space cost 20 to 26.6 cents in Mount Auburn, 26.6 cents in Brooklyn's Green-Wood, and 9.7 cents in Albany Rural. See Rotundo, "Fortunate Coincidences," 259; idem, "The Rural Cemetery Movement," *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 109, no. 3 (July 1973): 233; Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 53, 83-84.

[64]Although lot size was not fixed at Laurel Hill, the plan allowed for limited standardization. "The lot sizes vary from 8 feet by 10, 10 by 12, to 12 by 15, &c.," according to [Smith], *Old Mortality*; the largest was 1000' square feet. See also R. A. Smith, *Smith's Illustrated Guide to and through Laurel Hill Cemetery* (Philadelphia: Willis P. Hazard, 1852), 37. Actual dimensions and prices of sold lots appear in the company's sales books, at LHC. The additional fee went toward a "Permanent Fund" and represented ten percent of the total purchase price. Prior to her death, the sickly Mercy Carlisle had toured Laurel Hill and "expressed her decided wish to be interred under the group of four large pine trees, now enclosed by granite and iron railing, near the center of the plot [Sec. E, #1];" [John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 12; see also "Laurel Hill," *Godey's*, 108, and *Rules and Regulations of the Laurel Hill Cemetery of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: [n.p.], 1892), 10.

[65]John Jay Smith, Memoranda, 31 March 1837, as quoted in HSR, 19; see also 79.

special status through an orderly array of boxwood, cedar and rhododendron. Yet the managers were loathe to enact any burial prohibitions, and Shrubbery lots were some of the first to sell.[66]

Two small but significant deviations from the original layout appear in 1837 plans. One is the placement of tower-like bastions at either end of the front wall. The other is the decision to install a sculpture group known as *Old Mortality and His Pony* directly behind the gatehouse. Laurel Hill's board had procured the work from its Scottish creator, James Thom, the previous summer, following his visit to the cemetery. Now the managers determined where to locate their acquisition, and Notman devised a Gothic Revival canopy for it.[67]

By December, Laurel Hill's gatehouse, cottage and boundary enclosures were finished. Work on the mansion, chapel, green house and stables was put off until the following spring. Since the mansion was "warmed in winter and commodious enough to contain any funeral procession," it probably continued to serve as an interim chapel.[68] Some or all of the postponed projects were remodelings and perhaps received second priority for this reason. However the larger cause of the delay was almost certainly the economic crisis of that year. Even before the "panic of 1837" struck, lot sales had been slow. Now the managers faced the prospect of depression as the project cost neared $100,000. Having supplied most of this capitol himself, Nathan Dunn vowed to underwrite the remaining construction.[69]

Despite Dunn's commitment, progress lagged. In July, 1838, Smith's journal entries assumed a tone of frustration. His sentiments were soon echoed by a columnist for the *National Gazette* who admired the cemetery's "fine and noble collection of trees," but asserted " that the niche designed, it is said, for the statue of Old Mortality, has had abundant time to become dry enough

---

[66]HSR, 55-59; John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 100-101.

[67]The bastions appear in Hammond's engraving, second phase, and in Wild and Chevalier. Smith discusses the circumstances that brought Thom and his sculpture to Laurel Hill in *Recollections*, 254-255. The "Statement of cost of Real Estate and improvements..." shows Thom received $1000 on 27 June 1836. By 11 April 1837, the statues had been delivered to the cemetery; Smith, Memoranda, as cited in Schuyler notes. A plan, dating from June or July, 1837 and reproduced in [Smith's] *Old Mortality,* indicates the statues' intended location, HSR, 48. On Thom, see also Richard J. Koke, "James Thom and the Washington Monument: A Scotsman on the Nyack Turnpike in the 1840's," *South of the Mountains: The Historical Society of Rockland County [NY]* 42, nos. 1 and 2 (January-June 1998): 3-23. My thanks to T. Scott Kreilick for alerting me to this article.

[68]John Jay Smith, Memoranda, 8 December 1837 as quoted in HSR, 19, 29. The description of the mansion appeared in the *United States Gazette*, 12 December 1836. According to the cemetery's *Regulations* (1837 ed.), 4, "This building will be arranged for the accommodation of lot-holders; and visiters generally will be allowed to make use of it until otherwise notified."

[69]John Jay Smith, Memoranda, 8 December 1837, as cited in HSR, 29; Waston, *Annals* (1927 ed.), 3: 138. Earlier in the year, Smith had bemoaned the general "gloom" created by the panic but consoled himself with the fact that "the business of death does not stand still," Memoranda, 31 May 1837, as quoted in Jim Quinn, "The Resurrection of Laurel Hill," *Philadelphia Magazine* 69, no. 9 (September 1978): 229.

for it[s] reception; and most of all, that the chapel or church should be immediately completed."[70]

Laurel Hill's board took action in the next month. Exactly when the builders ceased work is unclear, but an 1839 insurance survey records all cemetery structures as complete. Final results generally followed Notman's original intentions. The greatest departure occurred in the gatehouse plan, where single-room lodges became two-story, four-room dwellings. Exterior adjustments to the gatehouse and the chapel did not substantially alter either building's character.[71]

Managers and Lot-holders Shape the Cemetery

Completion came as the venture's financial prospects brightened. Two years after opening, the cemetery company had sold almost half of the 800 lots Price had initially surveyed.[72] Old Mortality and increased sales brought more visitors. Some were sightseers, others lot-holders, eager to shape the small plots which were theirs by law and deed. Wishing to maintain some control over the site's usage and appearance, the managers began distributing written rules in the summer or fall of 1837. The *Regulations* were reprinted, with periodic revisions, throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century.[73] They supplied the terms through which so many interested parties negotiated the future of an idyllic enclave.

In this social contract for the city of the dead, property rights were paramount. Among the company's greatest selling points was its ability to guarantee that lot-holders "will have the ground they purchase secured to them, and their families and heirs, for a burial place for ever."[74] This guarantee was, after all, the primary functional difference between Laurel Hill and traditional urban graveyards. However, unlike non-profit cemetery corporations, Laurel Hill did not spread managerial powers broadly. Lot owners were deed holders, not shareholders, and as such would have abide by certain unnegotiable rules. Lots could be resold only under extenuating circumstances and with management's consent - a clause precluding speculation. Solid yet unobtrusive was the standard for construction. Two feet was the maximum height for

---

[70]John Jay Smith, Memorandum, 1 July 1838, as quoted in HSR, 29; "Laurel Hill," *National Gazette*, 21 July 1838.

[71]LHC Minutes, 24 August 1838; Hammond engraving, first state; Franklin Survey no. 1967; HSR, 26, 29-30, 81-82. Notman received four payments after his initial one. The last occurred on 2 January 1840, at which time the architect's earnings from cemetery company projects totaled $668.12; Cash Book No. 1, [North] Laurel Hill Cemetery; HSR, 32.

[72][John Jay Smith], *Regulations* (1839 ed.), 3.

[73]Starting in 1844, the *Regulations* were published as part of a larger *Guide to Laurel Hill Cemetery*. For information on later editions of the *Guide*, see McDannell, 283 (n. 13).

[74][John Jay Smith], *Regulations* (1837 ed.), 8.

perimeter walls; four feet, six inches for fencing and shrubbery. Tree planting without prior approval was forbidden. Acknowledging their limited ability to dictate taste, the managers dealt with aesthetic matters through strongly-worded "suggestions." They emphatically discouraged such burial customs as "raising a mound of earth over graves" or installing conventional head- and foot-stones. Flowers were acceptable and low markers preferable.[75]

In composing the first *Regulations*, the authors were at pains to demonstrate their concern for the commonweal. Deploring the construction of underground vaults, they appealed to the lot-holder's conscience. How could he justify an antiquated mode of burial, so inherently unhealthy, and to "neighbors so inconvenient, defacing the beauty of the contiguous enclosures, grass, flowers and other ornaments"?[76] Similar rhetoric surfaced elsewhere in the document. The section on Monuments had a particularly paternalistic slant:

> The managers have no wish to interfere with individual taste in the construction of monuments, &c.; but to protect the interest of each separate purchaser, they reserve to themselves explicitly the right to prevent erection of large improvements which might interfere with the general effect, or obstruct any principal view.[77]

Other sections dealt with issues of class and race. While direct references to social groups were few, the *Regulations* expressly forbid the interment of blacks. Limited burial space was available for whites of modest means. They could purchase single graves, which were isolated from the family lots and too small to permit future burial of other family members. As for visitation, the general public was welcome to tour the premises on foot . Saddle horses were barred and only lot-holders could enter in carriages. On Sunday, the main day of leisure for the working class, the gates were closed to all but funeral-goers and lot-holders with company-issued tickets.[78]

When first published, Laurel Hill's code amounted to a strong assertion of Whig values in the age of Jacksonian democracy. The board's emphasis on orderly conduct, respect for the Sabbath and disdain for blacks were all in keeping with contemporary patrician thought. Noted diarist and early Laurel Hill admirer Sidney George Fisher represented the caste of Philadelphia society the cemetery wished to attract. In October, 1838, shortly before touring Laurel Hill, he wrote,

---

[75]Ibid., 5-6, 8-9; see also Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 71.

[76]Ibid., 6-7.

[77]Ibid., 9.

[78]Ibid., 3, 4, 8, 11; McDannell, 283. For a broad discussion of the roles of class and race in the rural cemetery movement, see Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 83-85. Sloane observes that northeastern cemeteries frequently permitted African-American burial while their southern counterparts "were strictly segregated." Located between these regions, Laurel Hill obviously emulated the practices of the latter.

"Voted the Whig ticket and against the amendments to the Constitution." Fearing himself in the minority, he predicted that "all character of establishment and permanence will be taken away from the government, and its principles, together with the rights a Constitution is intended to protect, set afloat upon the uncertain & billowy sea of popular passion & opinion."[79] Viewed retrospectively, the *Regulations* seem to presage the establishment of twentieth-century gated communities. Here, after all, was a system through which middle- and upper-class whites could buy land in an enclosed site, receive some guarantee of property protection, and benefit from a constitution that prevented individual interests from infringing on those of the group.

If Laurel Hill's managers hinted at the social stratum whose dead they sought, they catered overtly to a smaller social unit, the family. John Jay Smith's stated motive for founding the institution made this emphasis natural: he had failed to find his daughter's grave in an aging urban burial ground. Worse still, the grave had been "filled with water" at the time of interment. Clay in the soil had created a "cup."[80] Smith dwelt on these details in his diary, and the diary was quoted in a popular magazine. His ordeal became a metaphor for the trauma that burial occasioned before the advent of the rural cemetery, and he emerged as the champion of Philadelphia's "most responsible families." No longer would deceased relatives be confined to the city. Now, only the heartless would dig graves "where the dead repose not, except surrounded by noises of discordant cries, the rumbling of carts and fire engines, and immersed in their clayey, moist beds."[81]

A focus on the family was not peculiar to Laurel Hill. It permeated the rural cemetery movement and, indeed, much of Victorian culture. As the industrial revolution ground onward and American cities swelled ever-larger, multiple forces shook the old foundations of social order. Factories pulled family members from the home and isolated them from each other for much of the day; institutions assumed control of such traditionally domestic tasks as the care of the young, the elderly and the frail; daily routines were increasingly regulated by the clock. The rural cemetery was one of many responses to these conditions. It joined the social club, the fraternal lodge, the benefit association and similar venues in compensating for the toll on family and community in the age of the industrial metropolis.[82]

While people poured into the city and adjusted to new ways of life, the cultural impetus to

---

[79]Fisher, 59 (10 October 1838).

[80]"Laurel Hill," *Godey's*, 107; see also McDannell, 275. Quin, 229-30, quotes a section of Smith's Memoranda dealing with the girl's re-interment at Laurel Hill. The event again forced Smith to confront the watery grave - and it was *not* the one he and his wife had "wept repeatedly over...What a mockery of grief!"

[81]"Laurel Hill," *Godey's*, 108.

[82]Warner 61; Stannard, 44-46, 54; Rotundo, "Fortunate Coincidences," 258; Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 68, 70.

romanticize the rural past grew stronger. The first arguments for extra-urban burial stressed the danger that proximity to dead posed to the living. After 1830, rural cemetery advocates added a second, more romantic rationale. The living might be confined to the city but the deceased deserved better. Families owed them respite from the crass, mercenary and unpredictable aspects of urban life - "the changing interests of man."[83]

Many of the ideals that eventually gave rise to America's picturesque, planned suburbs crystalized during the rural cemetery movement. Like their later residential counterparts, Mount Auburn and Laurel Hill were naturalistic, suburban enclaves composed of many privately owned lots. Cemetery managers and the popular press encouraged contemporaries to consider the burial lot as a place where the embattled Victorian family could find permanent refuge. Death need not join the list of factors weakening the family. Rather, it was an opportunity for lasting reunion. As one author eloquently concluded, "We cannot rid ourselves of the feeling that there is companionship even in the grave."[84]

The concept of the family lot as inviolable extension of the home could assume literal form. Monuments and mausoleums that imitated houses were standard rural cemetery features, especially after 1850. Still more common was the expression of domestic unity through lot arrangement. A family would enclose its property with stone copings and iron fences, plant flowers within, and erect a substantial monument at the center. Such "improvements" might occur well before any family member had died. As time passed, this idyllic space was populated by the dead and its adornments required maintenance. Survivors obliged, and the lot-tending process became an active link between the living family and the deceased one.[85] The author of a commercially published guidebook described

> ...almost every enclosure in [Laurel Hill] displaying the appearance of a garden - every grave a flower bed. Around these hallowed spots the bereaved are continually seen, pruning the young branches, wreathing chaplets to adorn the memorials, or seated by the mounds, ruminating on the dearest memories.[86]

Those disinclined to personally maintain the familial lot could still obtain this service from the

---

[83][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 13.

[84]A. D. Gridley, "Cemeteries," *New Englander* 85 (October 1863): 607; Sears, 8, 104-08. Many scholars of the rural cemetery movement have touched on its connection to the rise of the picturesque suburb. Laurel Hill's own John Jay Smith became a minor voice in mid-century suburb planning, expressing his views on the subject in *The Horticulturist*. See John Jay Smith, "Parks versus Villages," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 6 (April 1856): 153-55.

[85]McDannell, 298; Rotundo, "Fortunate Coincidences," 259; Ames, 653.

[86]R. A. Smith, *Illustrated Guide*, 109.

cemetery company.

Along with Mount Auburn, Laurel Hill played a pioneering role in fixing the rural cemetery as the realm of the family. In the *Regulations* and less prosaic *Guides*, Laurel Hill's managers reiterated their "assurance that the remains of father and child, husband and wife, could repose side by side" in a protected environment.[87] The success of this strategy became clear as the number of marble monuments, granite borders and ornate fences multiplied. The Wharton, Fotterall, Lentz and Bohlen lots still provide clear testimony to the rise of the family at Laurel Hill. But for every family lot that retains its character today, several more once existed. Their combined effect was originally (if unintentionally) supplemented by another site feature. After seeing the former Sims homestead, an early visitor referred poignantly to the "ancient mansion...that was once the abode of domestic enjoyment." For him the vacant relic had become the cemetery's largest family monument.[88]

The family lot's renaissance marked a change in American culture. It was one of several indicators the family unit was beginning to hold greater sway than the church over urban bourgeois life. Until 1800, the tradition of churchyard burial had gone virtually unchallenged. Now the private plot and its institutional setting threatened to reduce church authority and the income of clergy who profited from the old arrangement. Predictably, Laurel Hill received initial opposition from clerics and conservatives.[89]

John Jay Smith was no atheist. Born into the Society of Friends, he remained a lifelong member. Yet he was sharply critical of those Quaker customs which he believed to be stilted or outmoded, and he counted burial practice in this category.[90] As historian J. William Frost has written, "The rapid increase of immigration, the loss of political power and prestige, and the undynamic quality of traditional Quaker worship stimulated prominent Philadelphia Friends to rethink the implications of their faith."[91] It was under these circumstances that Smith came to advocate

---

[87][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 13. Laurel Hill was not the first Philadelphia cemetery to make family unity in death a major selling point. This distinction prohably belongs to Mutual; see *Preamble to and Constitution of the Mutual Family Burying Ground Association*, passim.

[88][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 144.

[89]Schuyler, "Evolution," 292; Sears, 106.

[90]John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 52, 81, 140-41, 266-68, 303, 382. Toward the end of his life, Smith came increasingly under the influence of Methodism and tended to view his Quaker past with a somewhat jaundiced eye. However, his disdain for Quaker burial practice developed early on. Shortly after founding Laurel Hill, he stated his belief that Friend's treatment of the dead "is not consonant with the feelings of our nature implanted by a merciful God to humanise us, I might say to civilise us," Memoranda, 20 March 1837, as quoted in Schuyler notes.

[91]J. William Frost, "Years of Crisis and Separation: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1790-1860," in *Friends in the Delaware Valley: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting 1681-1981*, ed. John M. Moore (Haverford [PA]: Friends

burial reform. And while his eagerness to advance a commercial alternative stemmed partly from self interest, his plan seems to have been accepted or at least tolerated by the urban Quaker establishment. Rural Quakers were more leery of novel capitalist enterprise, but they were not Laurel Hill's target market; many had, in fact, split ranks with city-dwelling Quaker patricians like Smith to follow the lead of Elias Hicks, a minister whose doctrinal "unsoundness" Smith decried. In any case, Smith and his collaborators were not exclusively concerned with attracting Quaker patrons. Laurel Hill was a business, ostensibly open to all whites who could afford the price of a lot.

James Ronaldson had already "prepared the public mind" to accept a non-sectarian burial company in Philadelphia. Smith acknowledged as much. What made Laurel Hill risky was its greater size and distance from the city, *combined* with its non-sectarian basis.[92] Early on, potential investors had shunned the project "on the plea that our citizens were too much attached to the customs of their ancestors, the churches and so forth."[93] Churchmen voiced complaints as well, claiming the cemetery was too remote for them to attend funeral services. In mid 1836, Smith wrote bitterly, "we constantly feel that we have to contend with some prejudice & with the feelings of those interested in the sale of church grounds."[94]

Financial panic struck the following year. Laurel Hill survived, in large part because conditions in urban churchyards were getting worse. In one instance, a riot had broken out after the German Reformed Church re-interred its dead "in a brutal manner." Such events prompted even the devout to become Laurel Hill's "willing patrons."[95] As for the clergy themselves, Smith discovered he could overcome opposition through accommodation. When ministers expressed interest in buying lots, the company gladly obliged. A greater victory came in August, 1840, when St. John's Lutheran Evangelical Church acquired most or all of Section O - a total of 27, 523 square feet. Philip Price returned to lay out the lots, following Smith's directions.[96] The

---

Historical Association, 1981), 66. See also 60, 67.

[92][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 11.

[93]"Laurel Hill," *Godey's*, 107.

[94]John Jay Smith, Memoranda, 30 June 1836, as quoted in Schuyler notes. See also Schuyler, "Evolution," 292; Watson, *Annals* (1927 ed.), 3: 138.

[95]John Jay Smith, Memoranda, 30 June and 24 October 1836, as quoted in Schuyler notes; Watson, *Annals* (1927 ed.), 138. On later church patronage, see LHC minutes, 21 April 1864, in which Smith credits Benjamin W. Richards for softening [Episcopalian] objections.

[96]LHC minutes, 6 August 1840; P[hilip] M. Price, Spring Garden [Philadelphia], Pennsylvania, to J[ohn] J. Smith, ALS, 12 October 1840, Library Company of Philadelphia, under Smith papers; deed between Laurel Hill Cemetery Company and St. John's Lutheran Evangelical Church, 24 October 1840, at LHC. The managers' willingness to accommodate members of any one denomination risked angering others. On 2 July 1840, the board

arrangement set a precedent, and other congregations eventually acquired their own parts of the cemetery. In 1844, the company's first official guidebook contained much text defending rural cemeteries from a Christian perspective.[97] By this time, however, the point was largely mute.

Perhaps Laurel Hill's single biggest advantage over churchyard burial was the promise of permanence. Without this certainty, the family lot would not have succeeded. Reaction to the German Reformed Church's reburial campaign underscored what Smith already knew: people hated to see familial remains disturbed. "Permanence" and "perpetuity" thus became buzzwords in the *Regulations* and the company charter. The managers sold lots primarily to families, prohibited resale, and demanded that vault construction be sturdy. Several years after installation, certain building and plant materials were disintegrating. Accordingly, company literature began to discourage the use of marble while praising the durability of granite and holly. "In preparing these memorials, and in the enclosure of lots, we should keep in view the uncertainty of life, as well as that those we now look to for the preservation of our iron and marble are also mortal....[98]

When the board purchased *Old Mortality and His Pony*, they acquired a symbol uniquely suited to their institution. The ideal of permanence was compelling but abstract. James Thom's sculpture gave it physical form. In a romantic folktale recounted by Sir Walter Scott, Old Mortality is a pious peasant whose life's work is to travel the Scottish countryside, using his chisel to restore the epitaphs of Presbyterian martyrs. Thom had carved figures of the itinerant and his pony in Britain, then brought them to America for show. By the time he reached Philadelphia, the pony had been shattered in transit. Smith and his colleagues bought the work with the proviso that Thom re-carve the broken piece and add a statue of Scott to the pair.[99]

The managers' placement of Thom's work made it the visual keynote of the cemetery. Their intent, of course, was to publicly equate the subject's mission with their own: "as Old Mortality loved to repair defaced tombstones, so the originators of the plan of the Cemetery hope it may be the study of their successors to keep the place in perpetual repair, and to transmit it undefaced to a distant date."[100] This symbol of institutional commitment to the perpetuation of memory functioned on several levels. In the recent words of one scholar,

---

postponed Rev. G. W. Bethume's scheduled speech at the cemetery for fear of offending "some sectarians," LHC minutes.

[97][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 140-44, 158-60.

[98][John Jay Smith], *Regulations* (1839), 3, 7, 9; idem, *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 39-41. See also McDannell, 290.

[99][John Jay Smith], *Recollections*, 254-55.

[100][John Jay Smith], *Old Mortality*, 1.

> Old Mortality brought the memory of the righteous back to life, the noted Walter Scott revived the story of the forgotten religious itinerant, the owners of the cemetery reassembled the broken statue, and the future caretakers assured the eternal continuation of Laurel Hill.[101]

A newspaper columnist, visiting Laurel Hill in its early days, paid great attention to the *Old Mortality* group. While penning his impressions, he discerned both piety and patriotism in the pilgrim's occupation. It was Scottish patriotism, of course: Presbyterian devotion lacked the same connotations in America.[102] Yet cemetery managers liked this interpretation enough to reprint it, and with good reason. From the start, Laurel Hill commemorated not only the personal and familial past but also local and national history.[103]

The origins of this concept lay in century-old theories of English landscape gardening and Enlightenment-inspired notions about the place of history in a civilized society. More recently, the same ideals had surfaced in the planning of Pere Lachaise and Mount Auburn.[104] The first indication that Philadelphia was to follow their lead came in the form of a rhetorically charged pamphlet. Signed by Laurel Hill founder Frederick Brown and two prominent doctors, the document called for construction of an enormous monument to Philadelphia's scientific worthies. The design was modeled on the tomb of Caius Cestius, a pyramid in Rome's Protestant Cemetery. If all went as planned, a similar behemoth would stand in Laurel Hill.[105]

---

[101]McDannell, 289-90. See also George Thomas, "The Statue in the Garden," in *Sculpture of a City: Philadelphia's Treasures in Bronze and Stone* (New York: Walker Publishing Co., 1974), 37.

[102]Although most contemporary references to *Old Mortality* employ ecumenical or secular vocabulary, it is worth noting that Orthodox Quakers like Smith were increasingly receptive to Presbyterianism at this time (see Frost, 74, 79). What effect, if any, this had on the cemetery's decision to buy the statues is unclear.

[103] Article by "Mr. Walsb," *National Gazette*, reprinted in [John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed), 68. For another public tribute to *Old Mortality*, see "Old Mortality," *Godey's Lady's Book* 24, no. 16 (April 1842): 233-35.

[104]For discussions of monumental commemoration in the rural cemetery movement, see Blancbe Linden-Ward, "Putting the Past Under Grass: History as Death and Cemetery Commemoration," *Prospects* 10 (1985): 17-32; Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 79-81; Frencb, 48-49, 57.

[105]*Proposals for Erecting a Monument, by Subscription, in the Laurel Hill Cemetery, Commemorative of Native Genius and Worth, as Exemplified in the Life and Writings of the Late David Rittenhouse, Thomas Godfrey, Alexander Wilson, and Thomas Say, Citizens of Philadelphia,* (Philadelphia: [n. p.], 1836). The doctors joining Brown were Charles D. Meigs and Richard Harlan, both of whom had appropriate credentials for the project. Meigs was a prominent Philadelphia obstetrician with an interest in Roman history (see his *The Augustan Age* [Philadelphia: Adam Waldie, 1839]). Harlan was a physician and naturalist wbose paleontology brougbt him into collaboration with Thomas Say. Nowhere did the pamphlet name the larger body of whicb the committee was ostensibly a part. The tomb of Cestius was a Romantic icon. Keats was buried nearby, and Shelly's famous eulogy

The honorees had different specialties. Philadelphian Thomas Godfrey was credited with inventing an important navigational instrument, the mariner's quadrant. Another local, David Rittenhouse, had distinguished himself in astronomy and mathematics. Naturalist Alexander Wilson was a Scottish emigree; his twenty-year residency in Philadelphia legitimized his presence on the roster. Finally there was Thomas Say. He too was a bona fide Philadelphian, known for his writings on natural history and for his role in founding the city's Academy of Natural Sciences.

The pamphlet's authors considered the will to revere the "dust of some private friend or public benefactor" a "universal" human impulse. But, they emphasized, contemporary circumstances gave their proposal particular urgency. Now more than ever, Americans needed a "tangible memento of public consideration and gratitude for the services of the Dead, in order to keep alive disinterested and noble reflections and feelings." Only monumental commemoration could "oppose and beat back the reiterated surges of oblivion!"[106]

Such millenarian rhetoric reflects a "cataclysmic view of history" that surfaced in American culture during the 1830s. Apparent in art and literature of the period, this pessimistic perspective stemmed from the realization that all great empires eventually ran their course.[107] Though still young, the New Republic had passed its semicentennial, and patricians like Laurel Hill's founders worried that their fellow citizens were forgetting the lessons of history. Gaining political ascendancy, the Jacksonian man seemed bent on personal gain and greater individual rights. If the elite could lay claim to the past and interpret its lessons through monuments, they might stem the decline of the social order their ancestors had helped establish. Toward that end, the great pyramid would be "truly useful." On one hand, it would remind future generations of genteel Philadelphia's contribution to science. On the other, it would record the sponsor's own cultivation - his "sensibility to genuine worth, which ennobled the enlightened minds of a great Republic in the nineteenth century."[108]

---

of the place focused popular attention on it. Pyramids were also proposed for nineteenth-century Paris and London; see Etlin, "Landscapes," 23, 25, and N. B. Penny, "The Commercial Garden Necropolis of the Early Nineteenth Century and Its Critics," *Garden History* 2, no. 3 (Summer 1974): 62.

[106]*Proposals for Erecting a Monument*, 3-4.

[107]Linden-Ward, "Past Under Grass," 280, 291-92.

[108]*Proposals for Erecting a Monument*, 5. See also French, 57; Gary B. Nash, "Behind the Velvet Curtain: Academic History, Historical Societies and the Presentation of the Past," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 114, no. 1 (January 1990): 6-8; Blanche Linden-Ward, "Strange but Genteel Pleasure Grounds: Tourist and Leisure Uses of Nineteenth-Century Rural Cemeteries," in *Cemeteries and Grave Markers: Voices in American Culture*, ed. Richard E. Meyer (Logan [UT]: Utah State University Press, 1992), 298. The interests of the Laurel Hill Cemetery Company and those of Philadelphia's patrician class were essentially synonymous. Consummate patrician Nicholas Biddle was, for instance, one of the cemetery's first trustees.

The pamphlet was a call to action, fueled by nationalistic indignation. Its authors explained that while Europe had great monuments and sculptures, America was *rightfully* Europe's cultural superior. Thus, they demanded, "shall this first great Republic of a boundless continent, the home of the philanthropist, the cradle of the brave, yield to rivals whom she ought to have been the first to incite to exertion?" No less important than revealing the nation's glory was establishing Philadelphia's place in it. The pyramid honored "native genius," but the natives were, above all, "citizens of Philadelphia."[109]

The scheme was ambitious - too ambitious as it turned out. Perhaps the boosters overestimated genteel Philadelphia's interest in commemorating heroes of natural science, or perhaps potential sponsors realized the pyramid would benefit private enterprise more than the unwashed, amnesiac public. In either case, the financial turmoil that followed the proposal helped seal its fate. Committee members dispersed, and no one tried to revive their campaign when prosperity returned. Nonetheless, Brown's cohort had expressed cultural values shared by Laurel Hill's managers and early patrons. The pyramid proposal was important because it presaged the treatment of history in Laurel Hill's guidebooks and monuments.

During the 1830s, the American rural cemetery joined other institutions in preserving and ennobling the nation's past. Contemporary museums and historical societies were also patriotic reliquaries - attempts to fix the meaning of the Revolution and other pivotal events as the New Republic aged.[110] The same cultural urge had begun to produce public monuments. Large obelisks dedicated to Washington in Baltimore (1815) and placed on Boston's Bunker Hill battlefield (1825) were among the most conspicuous examples. In Boston, Mount Auburn emerged as a lineal descendant of earlier antiquarian endeavor: Jacob Bigelow had been on the Bunker Hill Monument design committee. In Philadelphia, John Jay Smith's commemorative credentials were more diverse. By the time he founded Laurel Hill, he was linked to almost every history-conscious institution in the city.

Since the 1820s, Smith had corresponded with antiquarian John F. Watson. Both men were natives of Burlington County, New Jersey, and both tended to idealize the Anglo-American colonial past. Watson was a bank cashier by trade. The job left him time to organize the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and undertake historical research. Like Washington Irving and others who worked in his genre, Watson mixed scholarship, anecdote, and romance, but his *Annals of Philadelphia* (1830) compiled much information in readable form. In subsequent

---

[109]*Proposals for Erecting a Monument*, 1, 4.

[110]Linden-Ward, "Past Under Grass," 281, 289, 294-95, 300, 307-08; Nash, 3-36; Wainwright, "The Age of Nicholas Biddle," 301; Barbara Clark Smith, "The Authority of History: The Changing Public Face of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 114, no. 1 (January 1990): 37-66.

editions, it became one of the standard histories of the city.[111]

Smith believed himself responsible for "no insignificant portion" of the *Annals*. In 1829 he had become Librarian of Philadelphia's Library Company, and his letters to Watson were surely informed by exposure to the Company's ponderous collection of historical materials after that date. Access to this horde had another, more personal meaning for Smith. Since the late eighteenth century, the institution had maintained the library of James Logan, William Penn's colonial agent and Smith's great-grandfather. This connection helped Smith secure the job. It also brought him closer to a legacy that would influence him throughout his life. After 1829, he pursued genealogy, autograph collecting, and the study of local history with particular zeal. [112]

Smith's fascination with the past extended beyond the written word. As a child he had felt "unbounded admiration" for the work of Charles Wilson Peale. By the 1830s, Peale had died and Smith found himself serving as treasurer of the Philadelphia Museum. Peale's brainchild was in decline, but people still came to see his curiosities of natural history and portraits of Revolutionary War heroes. Now, in addition to Library Company responsibilities, Smith had "control of all these wonders." Modern scholars of American antiquarianism have analyzed the connection between "literary and material retrospective;" John Jay Smith personified it.[113]

Smith's impulse to gather and display relics inevitably shaped Laurel Hill. He was determined to invest the grounds of his institution with historical meaning, and the other managers either shared or indulged his wishes. Initially, this policy resulted in controversy. Since 1824, the remains of Continental Congress Secretary Charles Thomson had lain in an unmarked grave on his Bryn Mawr estate. Thomson's great-nephew wished to confer a more formal memorial on the patriot and, in 1838, Laurel Hill's managers agreed. It is unclear who initiated the ensuing re-interment or if the process was clandestine. In any case, heirs of the deceased's wife had not given their consent and were outraged. One expressed his disgust in the *National Gazette*, the nephew

---

[111]Scharf and Westcott, 2: 1169; Nash, 6-9; Emma J. Lapsansky, "Patriotism, Values and Continuity: Museum Collecting and 'Connectedness,'" *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 114, no. 1 (January 1990): 67-74.

[112]John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 212; Scharf and Westcott, 2: 1183. See also George F. Frick, "The Library Company of Philadelphia: America's First Philosophical Society," in *Shaping a National Culture: The Philadelphia Experience,* 1750-1800," ed. Catherine E. Huchins (Winterthur [DE]: Winterthur Museum, 1994): 181-200. Beyond his political duties, James Logan assisted the Library Company, made significant contributions to American botany, and lived in genteel style on his Germantown estate. In these respects, he seems to have been a role model for Smith.

[113]John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 213; Linden-Ward, "Past Under Grass," 289. Smith was not the only Laurel Hill manager interested in museums. In 1838, Nathan Dunn established a Chinese Museum in downtown Philadelphia. Although the institution's subject matter was foreign, Sidney Fisher came away most impressed by the parallels between Chinese and American genteel life. See Fisher, 65-66 (25 December 1838); Wainwright, "The Age of Nicholas Biddle," 291.

responded with equal vehemence in the *American Daily Advertiser*, and Thomson's body stayed at Laurel Hill. Ill will over the incident lived on into the twentieth century.

The story of Thomson's removal has grown more convoluted with each retelling. Smith was eager to emphasize his own disinterest, and his daughter no less eager to substantiate his claims. Yet cemetery managers, whatever their role, clearly valued their acquisition at the time. They absorbed the cost of Thomson's lot and subsidized the construction of a five-ton obelisk on it. John F. Watson composed the epitaph.[114]

Another prized relic arrived in the same year. This was the body of inventor Thomas Godfrey, still valuable without the pyramid. Like Thomson, Godfrey had been buried on his family farm. In later years, the grave had fallen in the path of a "cart-lane," a point stressed in cemetery company literature. Watson orchestrated the transfer of the entire Godfrey family's remains to the cemetery. He also transplanted the original gravestone and transcribed its epitaphs "with the patience of an antiquary." Here was a major contribution to Laurel Hill's growing collection.[115]

Several motives underlay this pattern. As at Mount Auburn, the historical consciousness that drove Laurel Hill's promoters "was limited to the particular social class that celebrated its primary role in having shaped the past."[116] Laurel Hill's very design, an estate garden around a classical villa, signified the historic wealth and privilege of Philadelphia's merchant elite. For Smith, the remains of illustrious Philadelphians had a particularly genealogical appeal. Essays in his autobiography reveal a man bent on associating himself with a bygone "Quaker-governing class." His descent from James Logan afforded him special satisfaction, and it added meaning to Thomson's and Godfrey's presence at the cemetery: Thomson was related to the Logan family; James Logan was Godfrey's patron and champion. The two men's final placement at Laurel Hill helped secure Smith's place in contemporary Philadelphia society and also in posterity.[117]

---

[114]Much of the controversy hinged on the circumstances of disinterment. Had the undertaker and his accomplice removed the body during the daytime or the night? Had they talked with or fled from the local farmers who confronted them? In his *Recollections*, Smith wrote that the event had occurred "without remark or observation" and that Thomson's nephew had purchased the monument. The former statement was obviously untrue and the latter a half truth at best. Smith's daughter Elizabeth, who edited the *Recollections*, cited a *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* article of July, 1890, that "fully exonerates the Laurel Hill Company." See Smith, *Recollections*, 265; John F. Watson, *Annals of Philadelphia, and Pennsylvania, in the Olden Time* (Philadelphia: John Penington and Uriah Hunt, 1844), 571; John Francis Marion, *Famous and Curious Cemeteries* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1977), 61; LHC minutes, 24 August 1838; various loose papers relating to the incident at LHC.

[115][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 22; Watson, *Annals* (1844 ed.), 529-30.

[116]Linden-Ward, "Past Under Grass," 310.

[117]John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 2, 104-08, 264, 297; [idem], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 22; Watson, (1844 ed.), 528-29.

Another impetus for importing dead worthies was their advertising value. When Watson and Smith wrote of the first re-interments at Laurel Hill, it was in terms of civic duty: they had rescued Thomson and Godfrey from oblivion. However, Laurel Hill's own future was not entirely secure at the time. After a shaky start, the company was beginning to yield substantial personal profits for its founders but, as a business, continued to operate in the red.[118] Smith and his colleagues felt the need to "give confidence to the public" was pressing. They recognized history's ability to dignify a new institution, and were willing to pay for the privilege. As important as dignity was touristic appeal. In their marketing strategy, the managers evinced familiarity with a principle discovered earlier by Charles Wilson Peale: "entertainment disguised as education" had considerable profit potential; it, too, could sell lots.[119]

Hallowed remains continued to historicize and sanctify the cemetery in the 1840s. The bodies of distinguished military men had particular cachet.[120] First came Hugh Mercer, a Revolutionary war general, who had been buried in a downtown churchyard. After exhumation, his corpse was brought to Laurel Hill by "his countrymen of the St. Andrews and Thistle Societies." As Mercer's cortege made the symbolic voyage form city to country, it was accompanied by "thousands of our citizens." William B. Reed, the presiding minister, drew rhetorical inspiration from Mercer's first funeral. Few of the present generation could remember that event, he mused. Yet at the time, the nation had been "mourning her first child." Indeed, Mercer's "mangled corpse...with its death-wounds fresh and bloody, taught a struggling people the lesson of patriotic martyrdom." Mercer had died so others could enjoy the fruits of liberty. His reburial afforded a chance to rekindle the popular sense of debt and gratitude.[121]

Cemetery literature dwelt on Mercer's death and ultimate ascension to Laurel Hill's arcadian paradise. Less ink was spent on Navy Captains Isaac Hull and Alexander Murry, but the themes

---

[118]Smith repeatedly refers to the income he received from Laurel Hill while the company was still in debt (contrast LHC minutes, 2 July 1840 and 14 May 1841 with Smith, *Recollections*, 101, 103, 296). This discrepancy was possible because Laurel Hill's founders, not their company, owned the cemetery land. As trustees, they were to cover initial costs and receive all profits. In theory, this arrangement would end when the foursome or their heirs had been fully reimbursed, but vague definitions of expenses allowed for perpetual postponement of the transaction (see 1839 deeds). Meanwhile, "company" profits were minimal. A "Permanent Fund" derived from lot sales was ultimately meant to absorb operating expenses. Even this money was vested directly with the trustees, or rather with the Girard Life and Trust Company which Smith and Richards founded.

[119]Charles Coleman Sellars, "Peale's Museum," in *Historic Philadelphia, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 43, no. 1 (1953): 253. Reflecting on his life during the late 1830s, Smith wrote, "Laurel Hill Cemetery was then in progress, another of my plans, and I was treasurer of the Philadelphia Museum, and in that period took from the public's pocket sixty-five thousand dollars, by renting it [the museum] for public exhibitions, etc." (*Recollections*, 100.)

[120]For a list of Laurel Hill's illustrious dead and their accomplishments, see [John Jay Smith's] *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.) as well as Scharf and Westcott, 3: 1873-81.

[121][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 23-27; McDannell, 299-300.

were similar. These men had brought glory to their country, albeit after the Revolution. The story of their lives could teach valor, selflessness, and patriotism by example, and teach better if properly commemorated. In this way, Laurel Hill became a secular shrine to local heros of the New Republic.

Not all of the celebrated dead had fought on the nation's behalf. Many were heroes in a more strictly local or regional sense. There was Joseph S. Lewis, who had been instrumental in establishing Philadelphia's Waterworks; Julius Friedlander, founder of the Pennsylvania Institution for the Instruction of the Blind; the same institution's benefactor, William Y. Birch; the courageous young fireman Oscar Douglas. At a time when American cities competed to display strength, wealth and enlightenment, these men did justice to Philadelphia. Their deeds attested to the character of her citizenry.

Closely tied to Laurel Hill's history-museum function was the cemetery's role as a sculpture gallery. Monuments gave the lessons of the past a physical, tangible presence. There was obvious didactic power in epitaphs, and nationalism initially helped settle the question of form. A major force in the early stages of the rural cemetery movement was pride in national identity. It had driven Laurel Hill's ill-fated pyramid proposal of 1836, and it helped make obelisks the decade's grave markers of choice. Much of the obelisk's popularity stemmed from the form's double meaning. Like the pyramid, it was associated with Egypt (and eternity) as well as Rome (and republicanism).[122] By the time Laurel Hill opened, an obelisk had risen on Bunker Hill and another, more famous one, was planned for Washington. Locally, Charles Wilson Peale had adorned his estate-cum-museum, Belfield, with two obelisks.[123] One was meant to mark his future grave site. The other was a "Pedestal of Memorable Events," listing ninety dates significant in American history. Little surprise, then, that Godfrey, Thomson and Friedlander all reposed beneath obelisks.

After 1840, the aesthetic austerity once thought so in keeping with the new republic's values began to give way. Cemetery managers had remained silent on the subject of monument style since issuing the first *Regulations*. Then, in 1843, they exhorted lot-holders to embrace recent changes in taste:

> It has been the frequent remark of visiters - our own citizens as well as strangers - that a monotony already begins to be apparent in the *style and form* of the improvements; obelisk succeeds obelisk,

---

[122]John Zukowsky, "Monumental American Obelisks: Centennial Vistas," *Art Bulletin* 58, no. 4 (December 1976): 574-581. On classicism's moral and political associations during this period, see French, 49, and Neil Harris, *The Artist in American Society: the Formative Years, 1790-1860* (New York: George Braziller, 1966), 28-53.

[123]Therese O'Malley, "Belfield in American Garden History," in *New Perspectives on Charles Wilson Peale*, ed. Lillian B. Miller and David C. Ward (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1991), 271, 273. John Jay Smith visited Belfield as a child, and quite possibly in his later years as well; see his *Recollections*, 213.

> &c., with only slight variation, and if this is continued, we shall see, in time, too dull an [sic] uniformity to strike the mind with agreeable sentiments. This may be obviated by a little *inquiry before ordering a monument*, and by not always taking the advice of the stone mason....[124]

Classical iconography remained popular even as greater design diversity set in. Amongst the obelisks rose General Mercer's pedimented marble monument. Architect John M. Hamilton capped this with an urn and added military flourish: "a sword and scabbard, surrounded by radii of glory." No less inspired by antiquity was Hamilton's design for William Birch. A bundle-column on a stepped base formed the pedestal for an urn. William Strickland furnished more complex designs for Isaac Hull and Alfred T. Miller. Hull's military career won him a Roman sarcophagus like that of Scipio, guarded from above by a sculpted eagle. Miller had died at the age of seven months. "A bud of beauty nipped by death," he was enshrined beneath a diminutive Greek temple containing the sculptor Pettrich's impression of a prone child.[125]

Joining this eclectic array were more personalized designs. John Notman's Egyptian Revival sarcophagus for Joseph Lewis showed the Waterworks in low relief. Ammunition production had been the livelyhood of Thomas Sparks. His shot tower thus appeared on his monument. Pyramids on Mary B. Cooke's sarcophagus likewise referred to her death in Egypt.[126]

The newer, more sculptural monuments were showpieces, and Notman drew many of them to illustrate the first official *Guide to Laurel Hill Cemetery* (1844). With one exception, obelisks were absent from the book. The appeal of the new forms was not simply aesthetic. Obelisks were generic and ubiquitous: without narrative inscriptions they could do no justice to individual biography. As metaphor and allegory were admitted into the cemetery, the need for lengthy epitaphs diminished. If visitors wanted to know more about Laurel Hill's famous dead, they could buy the new *Guide*. Starting in the mid 1840s, they could also turn to Watson's *Annals* or *American Historical and Literary Curiosities* which Watson co-authored with John Jay Smith. The latter book was a compilation of autographs and documents. Its material related primarily to "the events of the Revolution" and contained few direct references to Laurel Hill's worthies. Yet text and site were connected in broader sense. Laurel Hill's monuments had become the sculptural counterparts of the "curiosities" on the page or, for that matter, of the paintings in

---

[124][John Jay Smith], *Regulations of the Laurel Hill Cemetery, on the River Schuylkill, near Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: T. B. Town, 1843), 9-10.

[125][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 27, 31, 37, 38.

[126]Ibid., 32, 33.

Peale's Museum.[127]

James Thom's works announced the interrelationship of art and history at the cemetery. Besides Laurel Hill's hallmark sculpture, Thom crafted "a colossal figure of General Washington" that stood temporarily near the gatehouse. The piece might have joined the institution's permanent collection, but *Old Mortality and His Pony* captured Laurel Hill's purpose more completely. Within Notman's enclosure, the group evinced managerial commitment to reviving the past while hinting at sculptural and architectural attractions in the garden beyond.[128]

Many of the simpler monuments were stock items from local marble yards and monument dealerships. More complex designs required a higher level of skill, and by the mid 1840s certain local architects and craftsmen were habitually receiving commissions for work at the cemetery. This informal guild included John Notman, William Strickland, Thomas U. Walter, John Struthers, and his son William as well as the lesser known John M. Hamilton, Thomas Hargrave, Edwin Greble and Joseph Maples.[129] The first three men were prominent architects and, on artistic principle or patron request, applied their trademark styles to monument design. Strickland's Greek Revival Miller monument recalls his larger institutional projects, and the same applies to Notman's long-vanished "Gothic Monument" to the daughters of John A. Brown. The Ball mausoleum demonstrated Walter's facility with Egyptian form but he, like Notman and Strickland, could work in other modes. Only Hamilton relegated himself to stiff neoclassicism.

---

[127]Smith and Watson's book first appeared as *American Historical and Literary Curiosities; Consisting of Fac-Similies of Original Documents Relating to the Events of the Revolution, &c., &c., with a Variety of Reliques, Antiquities, and Modern Autographs* (Philadelphia: National Publishing Co., 1847). This edition contained "curiosities" pertaining to Charles Thomson, Thomas Godfrey, and steam boat pioneer John Fitch, all buried in Laurel Hill at the time of publication; the autograph of humorist Joseph C. Neal, later buried in Laurel Hill; the autograph of James Logan, Smith's illustrious ancestor; and various materials associated with David Rittenhouse, Thomas Say, and Alexander Wilson, who would have been re-interred at the cemetery had the 1836 pyramid proposal succeeded. Later editions (1860 and 1861) featured a note from explorer Elisha Kent Kane, and autographs of Commodores Alexander Murray and Isaac Hull, also buried at Laurel Hill. On Peale's museum, "It is worth noting that Peale seriously considered displaying the embalmed corpses of eminent men to show the highest levels attained in the natural world. When this proved unworkable, a substitute was found in his portraits that lined the walls...," Sidney Hart and David C. Ward, "The Waning of an Enlightenment Ideal: Charles Wilson Peale's Philadelphia Museum, 1790-1820," in *New Perspectives on Charles Wilson Peale*, ed. Lillian B. Miller and David C. Ward (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1991), 221. Smith's association with Peale's museum and other historical institutions underscores the role he played at Laurel Hill: curator of the dead. In 1843, J. C. Loudon began to elaborate this concept in *Gardener's Magazine*. See James Stevens Curl, *A Celebration of Death* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1980), 253.

[128]John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 255; Thomas, 37. Peale's Belfield featured a prominently placed bust of Washington, perhaps suggesting a connection between Laurel Hill and the museologist's didactic landscape; see O'Malley, "Belfield," 272. Thom's Washington ultimately came to rest in Rockland County, NY; see Koke.

[129]Unless stated otherwise, attributions for monument design and execution are based on [John Jay Smith's] *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.) and inscriptions on the monuments themselves.

His Philadelphia practice did not thrive and the circumstances of his career remain sketchy.[130]

Under the name of John Struthers and Son, the Struthers duo established high standards for stonework at Laurel Hill. John Struthers had a long-standing association with Strickland, and their firms collaborated on the Hull and Miller monuments. Yet the "Messrs. Struthers" were no architect's adjunct. Rather they were free agents, prepared to work with Notman and Hamilton or furnish original designs if necessary. Although both the younger and elder Struthers were identified as "marble masons" in 1840s directories, they had a small labor force of their own. When their firm was hired to execute Notman's scheme for Joseph Lewis' sarcophagus, they assigned the bas relief to "stone cutter" John Hill (also responsible for Strickland's famous Washington sarcophagus).[131]

Differentiating the skills and services offered by various subsets of the monument industry is difficult. In many cases, the tasks of masons, cutters, polishers, and sculptors seem to have overlapped. The facilities of sculptor and marble cutter Joseph Maples were sophisticated enough to produce a broad range of monument types, while too little information has surfaced on "Pettrich" to permit categorization. Marble mason Edwin Greble and ornamental carver Thomas Hargrave were probably staunch competitors, for both specialized in decorated obelisks. Greble's Philadelphia Steam Marble Works was a full-fledged factory, beset for a time by equipment failures and strikes. If Hargrave's operation was smaller, he apparently managed to retain a substantial ready-made stock.[132]

Another influence on monument design was John Jay Smith himself. The cemetery's *Regulations* established broad guidelines for construction on lots. Wanting greater say in the matter, Smith used the *Guide to Laurel Hill* to explicitly advertise the services of Notman,

---

[130]Greiff discusses and illustrates Notman's monuments at Laurel Hill, 56-60. Thomas, 38 (n.6) mentions Walter's connection to the Ball mausoleum; see also John Jay Smith and Thomas U. Walter, *A Guide to Workers in Metals and Stone* (Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1846), pl. 22, 70 etc.. Engravings in [John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.) credit "J. M. Hamilton" with the design of the Mercer, Birch and Douglas monuments. City directories list a John M. Hamilton, civil engineer, between 1839 and 1841, and a John Marshall Hamilton, architect, from 1848 to 1852. See also Moss and Tatman, 333.

[131]Known Struthers' works at Laurel Hill include the Mercer, Hull, Cooke, Lewis and Miller monuments, but others are shown in Smith and Walter, *Guide to Workers*, pl. 33, 48, 96. On the Struthers firm, see Jeffrey A. Cohen, "William Struthers, 1812-1876," in James F. O'Gorman and others, *Drawing Toward Building: Philadelphia Architectural Graphics, 1732-1986* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 88; Moss and Tatman, 771, Wainwright, "The Age of Nicholas Biddle," 288.

[132]Comparisons are based on advertisements and listings in 1840s city directories; [John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 20-38; R. A. Smith, *Philadelphia as It Is, in 1852* (Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1852), 331-55; *The Stranger's Guide in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1861), 216-28; Nicholas B. Wainwright, *Philadelphia in the Romantic Age of Lithography* (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1958), 214, 221; "Edwin Greble," in *The Biographical Encyclopaedia of Pennsylvania of the Nineteenth Century* (Philadelphia: Galaxy Publishing Co., 1874), 191.

Walter, Strickland and Struthers. The ostensible justification for this pitch was Smith's continued concern for the cemetery's "general effect." While the claim was valid enough, it belied his desire to promote men associated with the birth of his institution. This overlap of professional interests was underscored when Smith and Walter co-authored *A Guide to Workers in Metals and Stone* (1846). The book contained dozens of patterns for iron- and stonework culled from various sources. Funerary monuments and lot fences featured prominently, and designs by Walter and Struthers were generally identified as such. Here again the justification was public-spirited. The authors stressed that their aim was to "improve the taste" of consumers and manufacturers, and, in so doing, help America compete culturally and economically with Europe.[133]

As Smith gained a minor voice in funerary art, his real expertise lay increasingly in horticulture. In 1844, a journalist for *Godey's Lady's Book* reported:

> The planting of the cemetery has received the most sedulous care of Mr. Smith, whose personal attention on the spot has been unremitted for seven years. The curator informs us that Mr. S. has planted with his own hands twenty-four hundred trees, shrubs and roots...[134]

Early on, these efforts had focused on Laurel Hill's formal features. Balm-of-Gilead poplars artfully set off Old Mortality's baldachin and the rear facade of the gatehouse; a box tree rose from the center of the Shrubbery. Yet Smith was also intent on endowing the overall site with picturesque variety and a sense of enclosure. More of his time went in this direction during the late 1830s and early 1840s. Illustrations of the era show the result. In Notman's Ground Plan for the 1844 *Guide*, trees were now concentrated along the cemetery's northern, southern and eastern borders. Fewer new trees took root within the carriage loop, and the area north of the old entrance road remained more sparsely planted than the rest of the site. The final version of I. P. Hammond's Laurel Hill engraving (ca. 1845) corroborates Notman's plant locations but does not clarify his rather loose identification of species. The architect's General View, also prepared for the *Guide*, suggests the conspicuous use of conifers. However a clear conception of the cemetery's early plant composition comes only from Smith's writings.[135]

During the 1830s, Smith had kept sporadic note of his planting activities in his journal. Then, in

---

[133]*Guide to Workers in Metals and Stone*, preface and pl. 22, 33, 48, 96. In the same year, Smith and Walter also published *Two Hundred Designs for Cottages and Villas, Etc., Etc.*, (Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1846). Laurel Hill's 1843 *Regulations* (p. 10) advised lot-holders to choose monuments shown in drawings at the company's offices. These were probably the same designs shown in Smith's books.

[134]"Laurel Hill," *Godey's*, 108.

[135]HSR, 56-59.

the 1844 *Guide*, he inserted a comprehensive list of "the most beautiful" tree and shrub species on the grounds. Here were eight kinds of pine, eleven of oak, nine of magnolia and seven of poplar - to name a few. While the varieties listed were those "deemed suitable for the adornment of a cemetery," Smith confessed to having broader botanical ambitions: "the managers desire that one specimen at least of every valuable tree and shrub which will bear the climate of this latitude, shall be found in these grounds, forming a species of Arboretum."[136]

Such aspirations inevitably brought Smith into contact with Andrew Jackson Downing. After publishing his *Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening* (1841), Downing was fast becoming the preeminent American authority on horticulture, landscape design and "rural taste." His basic precepts were distilled from English landscape theory of previous decades but struck a chord with American readers; droves of "improvers quickly followed his lead." Smith was among them, and the two men began corresponding around the time the *Treatise* appeared. Soon they developed a "warm friendship," and over the ensuing decade their letters chronicled the major events of their lives. Because Smith was also Downing's client, their relationship had a direct impact on Laurel Hill. Smith frequently turned to Downing's Newburg, New York nursery when in need of rare, delicate or newly imported plants.[137]

Familiarity with Downing and his work may well have whetted Smith's interest in John Claudius Loudon. Loudon was Downing's primary intellectual progenitor, having written extensively on landscape gardening in Britain since the early 1800s. Following Repton, Loudon rejected rugged, unmoderated naturalism - what Downing later termed the "Picturesque." Loudon believed that flowers and other overtly decorative elements had a place in the garden, and that plantings should be arranged to emphasize the identity of individual species. This style, known as the Gardenesque, became his major contribution to landscape design. Around 1830, he also began to address the question of cemetery design and came to advocate a distinctive "cemetery style." He premised that the cemetery's physical and social function limited the kinds of plantings appropriate to the institution.[138]

Smith was probably attuned to Loudon's ideas before 1840. Laurel Hill's tree and shrub layout was essentially Gardenesque, and the first *Regulations* had encouraged lot-holders to plant flowers. Moreover, the heavy use of pine in the landscape accorded well with Loudon's

---

[136][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 53.

[137]Downing's letters to Smith are filed at the Library Company of Philadelphia under Smith's name. See also John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 242, 258-59; David Schuyler, *Apostle of Taste: Andrew Jackson Downing, 1815-1852* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 55, 76, 80, 84, 89, 94, 170, 217, 282; Judith Zuk, "Laurel Hill Cemetery," *The Green Scene* 9, no. 5 (May 1981): 19.

[138]George B. Tatum, "The Emergence of an American School of Landscape Design," *Historic Preservation* 25 (April-June 1973): 36; Chadwick, 54-55, 58, 60; Curl, "Early British Cemeteries," 237, 252; idem, "John Claudius Loudon and the Garden Cemetery Movement," in *A Celebration of Death*, 244-64.

recommendations for cemeteries. Yet it was Downing who did so much to popularize Loudon in America, and this may have inspired Smith to follow suit. In 1846 Smith published *Designs for Monuments and Mural Tablets: Adapted to Rural Cemeteries, Church Yards and Chapels*. As Smith admitted on the title page, his book owed much to Loudon. Indeed, whole sections were copied verbatim from the Scotsman's 1843 publication, *On the Laying Out, Planting, and Managing of Cemeteries and on the Improvement of Churchyards*. What Smith contributed was an attention to American geography and burial conditions. *Designs for Monuments* also omitted Loudon's call for strict formality in cemetery design - a change that met with Downing's approval.[139]

Among the most useful gifts that Smith obtained from Loudon was the vocabulary needed to describe the sort of institution Laurel Hill had become. Interspersing Loudon's words with his own, Smith posited that cemeteries function as "historical records." In another instance, Loudon seemed almost to refer to Smith's and Watson's multifaceted accomplishments when describing a churchyard's function: "It is still to the poor man a local history and biography, though the means of more extended knowledge are now amply furnished by the diffusion of cheap publications...."[140] Of all the statements Smith borrowed from Loudon, one encapsulated the professed aims of Laurel Hill's founder's especially well. A cemetery, "properly designed, laid out, ornamented with tombs, planted with trees, shrubs and herbaceous plants, all named, and the whole properly kept, might become a school of instruction in architecture, sculpture, landscape-gardening, arboriculture, [and] botany." These ideas had surfaced in fragmentary form before. Loudon put them together and Smith perceived their relevance in America.[141]

Loudon's words suggested the potential quantity and variety of features in a rural cemetery. In the *Regulations* and *Guide,* Laurel Hill's proprietors described the combined effect. The *"toute ensemble"* that managers and lot-holders had created by the mid 1840s was striking. Enframed on three sides by trees, the grounds were dense and lush in some places, light and open in others. Qualities that Downing categorized as the Picturesque and the Beautiful met in the landscape's "gentle declivities, its expansive lawns, its hill beetling over the picturesque stream, its rugged

---

[139]Schuyler, "Evolution," 302; French, 56. *Designs for Monuments* evinces Smith's tendency to reuse his own work as well as others'. The book includes text from the 1844 *Guide to Laurel Hill* and plates from the 1846 *Guide to Workers in Metals and Stone.* Smith later elaborated his own cemetery design philosophy in a series of articles for *The Horticulturist*; see "Rural Cemeteries," n.s., 6 (August - October 1856).

[140]John Jay Smith, *Designs for Monuments*, 7; Curl, "Early Britisb Cemeteries," 247.

[141]John Jay Smith, *Designs for Monuments*, 6. The proposition that cemeteries had didactic powers was not new. Loudon bad declared that burial and botanical display were compatible by 1828, and there was a long gentlemanly tradition of placing history and botany side by side in the garden. As mentioned above, Mount Auburn represented the first major synthesis of these ideas in America. See Scbuyler, "Evolution," 294, 300; French, 55; Curl, "Early British Cemeteries," 228, 231; Rotundo, "Fortunate Coincidences," 264-65; O'Malley, "Belfield," 273-76.

ascents, its flowery dells, its rocky ravines, and its river-washed borders."[142]

Manmade features were equally crucial to the composition. A tour route, appearing in the 1844 *Guide*, revealed a carefully constructed relationship between nature, naturalism and overt artifice. The text conducted visitors down a path that changed direction at frequent intervals. First the wayfarer encountered a sequence of monuments and buildings that included the chapel, the cottage and the tombs of Godfrey and Hull. Historical dignity and stylistic variety were clearly the point. A steep descent then brought "fine old trees of beech and oak" into close view, while the Schuylkill appeared far below; "persons of taste cannot but be gratified with the rural character of the picturesque scene," the *Guide* suggested. As the tour continued, its subject matter grew weightier. The visitor passed from the trees' "solemn shade," to Thomson's obelisk and, at last, came upon "a stone cross, partially covered with vines, on a point of rock." Inscribed on the icon was a poetic eulogy from its sponsor. A "devoted admirer" of Laurel Hill's environment, he had left it "soothed in spirit...A happier, better man." This testament to nature's redemptive power formed the journey's culminating episode. Of the remaining options, the most spectacular was a tree-ensconced "summer-house," affording vistas across land and water.[143]

Following a leisure trip to Laurel Hill, Philadelphian Sidney George Fisher noted in his diary: "Wandered about the cemetery for half an hour, looking at monuments & gravestones...and gazing at the beautiful view up and down the river."[144] Much of the intended experience involved distant views. In addition to their aesthetic value, they affirmed isolation, and isolation had been inherent in almost every stage of Laurel Hill's development. The site's location, the managers' early attention to gates and fences, the planting arrangement, the terms of John Sherwood's lease - all were symptoms of the effort to establish a place apart.

Out-stepping the city was part of the idea. The proprietors confidently claimed their institution was "removed beyond the probable approach of active business or private dwellings" and therefore "never liable to be overrun by pedestrians from [Philadelphia's] streets." Yet separation was also key to the cemetery's larger, metaphorical function: transcendence. Reminders of terrestrial struggle and aspiration must not obscure the larger lessons of life conveyed by natural scenery and commemorative monuments. Laurel Hill was meant to inspire "the most refined and devout feelings of the heart, separating them awhile from the world, and elevating them to those spiritual associations which should ever be connected with death."[145]

---

[142][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 13.

[143]Ibid., 6-8. The summer-house appears in most 1830s and 1840s plans of the cemetery. A lightly built gazebo, it stood southwest of the Joseph Lewis monument, between Sections G and S.

[144]Fisher, 60 (13 October 1838).

[145][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 11, 14, 16.

In this contemplative environment, the visitor could not avoid a gentle confrontation with death's inevitability. One writer described mourners in a funeral procession, "slowly winding their way among those marble mementos of our common destiny, while the 'ever whispering pines' send forth their soulful music overhead, and the weeping willows bend to the passing breeze."[146] While such reminders of man's fate were central to the rural cemetery experience, they were only half the point. What differentiated Laurel Hill's message from that of the traditional graveyard was the prospect of "happy immortality" for the spirit. Through the influence of Armenianism and other "liberalizing" doctrines, the dour, Calvinist view of death that had long held sway in Protestant America softened substantially during the early nineteenth century. The rural cemetery movement gave material expression to this transition. Traditional gravestones were discouraged, and the new monuments evinced confidence in the afterlife through icon and epitaph.[147] In the same period, Washington Irving asked, "Why should we seek to clothe death with unnecessary terrors, and to spread horrors around the tomb of those we love?" Quoting this rhetorical question became a convention of rural cemetery literature, and Laurel Hill's was no exception. Death was repeatedly likened to sleep. It was a time of transition and a cause for optimism.[148]

An emphasis on Christian hope gave the cemetery a religious character, and this impression was deliberate. John Jay Smith and his colleagues had founded a non-sectarian institution, but placed it squarely on ecumenical (though broadly Protestant) foundations. "Let no man" they warned, "tread with levity or profaneness the mazes of the cemetery grounds; it is the Christian's commentary on the truths and hopes he holds most sacred."[149] Notman's chapel, Thom's sculpture and the cross on the bluffs lent weight to these words.

In recent scholarship, Colleen McDannell has done much to restore the religious context of the rural cemetery movement. She focuses on "the persistent use of traditionally Christian themes and symbols" at Laurel Hill, and there is ample evidence for her argument.[150] The cemetery's *Guides* are replete with Christian metaphors; the landscape laden with Christian icons. There must now be no question that many Philadelphians understood the "pilgrimage" to and through Laurel Hill in religious terms.

Strong though it was, the cemetery's Christian message was highly ambiguous. Far from

---

[146]"Laurel Hill," *Godey's*, 107.

[147]Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 72-73; Sears, 103-04, 107.

[148][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 19, 151-55. The quotation originally appeared in Irving's *Sketchbook*, as noted by French, 41 (n. 19).

[149][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 18.

[150]McDannell, 278.

speaking with a single voice, Laurel Hill's monuments articulate the values of quasi-religious camps. Among them are the cults of domesticity, premature fatality, civic virtue and national identity. Drawing the line between secular and sectarian, religion and "religious feeling" is virtually impossible. Since no such line existed in "popular piety," the point may be mute. However, one of Laurel Hill's most adamant critics did not think so. Visiting Laurel Hill in 1849, Yale President and stern theologian Theodore Woolsey was unimpressed. To his mind, the landscape lacked the "solemnity" so necessary in a place of sepulcher. "These planted trees and walks, these views of the river, these iron settees, inviting rest, draw away the attention from the tombs." Natural and manmade beauty had little place in the cemetery, he asserted. Such attributes suited the homes of the living, not the dead. Worst among Laurel Hill's distractions was *Old Mortality*: "Venus weeping over the dead Adonis would be quite as appropriate."[151]

What sparked Woolsey's ire toward Laurel Hill and other rural cemeteries was the fundamentally un-Christian sub-text he read in their appearance. If one could see past the "skin-deep sentimentality, which the inscriptions and sepulchral flower beds display," vanity and injustice were everywhere.

> ...although families should ever lie together, we ought also, to recognize brotherhood in faith, or the brotherhood of human kind, or both. But at present in our new burial grounds, brotherhood in wealth seems to be the principle of admission. The poor must stand aloof and seek some less genteel place of burial.[152]

Equally deplorable was the lulling euphemism implicit in the new treatment of death. "Christianity would pronounce a sentence of condemnation upon everything which made the visitor unmindful that this was the last home of mortals..." Whatever its faults, the neglected churchyard had not been misleading in this regard.[153]

Toward the end of his diatribe, Woolsey supplied his readers with broad guidelines for monument design. He felt that variety was acceptable, and that there should be "a correspondence...between the ornaments of the tomb and the person buried there." Even expense was not, of itself, reprehensible. "Ostentation" on the other hand "should be avoided," especially when it took the form of "architectural show and dash." Diminutive reproductions of great buildings were made ridiculous by their scale. "If a little Doric temple of four feet square would be blamable on this account, how much more a baby-house Gothic cathedral...?"[154]

---

[151][Theodore D. Woolsey], "Cemeteries and Monuments," *New Englander* 28 (November 1849): 491-92.

[152]Ibid., 495.

[153]Ibid., 493, 496-97.

[154]Ibid., 498-500.

In the years following Woolsey's critique, several writers picked up parts of his cause. Some openly attacked the use of pagan symbols, others the more general appearance of "intruding anachronisms and mythology."[155] While the direct impact of these essays was probably limited, the number of overtly Christian monuments in Laurel Hill and other rural cemeteries did grow after mid century. At the same time, the iconography of funerary art again became more standardized. The cross and the Bible, the crown and the angel joined a host of secular forms whose meanings were commonly understood. The lamb, for instance, signified innocence, while the broken column betokened "life cut short." The lion and the dog represented courage and fidelity, the anchor hope (or naval service) and ivy memory. Architectural styles tended to have more loosely fitting associations. The Gothic was supposed to be uniquely Christian, while Egyptian and Moorish motifs were sometimes reserved for Jews.[156]

Design and Construction, Phase II

John Notman had little direct influence on Laurel Hill's plan after 1840. As the cemetery company finished surveying and adorning its original twenty acres, it abandoned the architect's picturesque principles and opted instead for simple, inexpensive rectalinearity. The shift was most evident north of the former entrance road to the Sims estate. Philip Price had laid out St. John's Church lots in Section O along paths that formed a cross; the area contained many single graves and was "generally void of ornate display." Section G was a simple grid. Its main paths ran east-west and were identified as "avenues" in one source. Section R was also "modest." The managers still intended to build semi-circular terraces in Section S, but rock outcroppings further north made any plans for a second such "amphitheater" futile. Instead, Section P took shape along several gently curving paths.[157]

The cemetery's architectural program was changing as well. An 1840 fire had destroyed the carriage house and stables, ridding the site of some older construction and, presumably, allowing the company to reap the benefits of a recent insurance policy. The incident eradicated man-made features that had influenced Notman's plan. Soon, another early structure would vanish.[158]

As Smith and his colleagues well knew, Laurel Hill was starting to fill up. Open ground

---

[155]R. A. Smith, *Illustrated Guide*, 100. See also [A. D. Gridley], "Rural Cemeteries," *Horticulturist* 5 (1855): 281-82; idem, "Cemeteries," 617.

[156]McDannell, 292-96; Thomas, 39; Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 77; Etlin, "Landscapes," 135.

[157]R. A. Smith, *Illustrated Guide*, 50, 51, 53, 108-09, 116. See also Hammond engraving, final phase (ca. 1845), Notman's "Ground Plan of Laurel Hill Cemetery" in [John Jay Smith] *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), company Sales Books for North Laurel Hill, and HSR, 60-61.

[158]HSR, 60-61. Notman's above-cited plan indicates that the "coach shed" shown behind the stables in the 1839 Franklin Fire Insurance policy may have survived the fire.

remained around the periphery, but the dead populated the core quite densely. When the search began for more space, the mansion was an obvious target; it was "in bad repair and nearly useless." In January, 1844, the managers voted for demolition. The woodwork would be sold at auction and the stone used to "terrace the amphitheater" in Section S. With these plans in mind, the board instructed Notman to omit the building from the General View he was drawing for the *Guide*. By fall the mansion was gone, victim to managerial thrift. Yet the same impulse had, in a sense, ensured the house's survival. Reused ashlar formed the first of three terraces, and the cellar was converted to burial vaults by means of brick partitions.[159]

Removing the mansion was a temporary remedy at best. The managers still needed to obtain more burial space, and their options were limited. The company's twelve acres east of Ridge Road would not do. Land there was ill suited for interment and its use for that purpose was forbidden by the company charter; since 1836, the property had served primarily as a visual buffer zone in front of the cemetery. By 1845, the business-minded managers were starting to lose sight of this necessity and resolved to build rental housing for workers in clear view of the gatehouse. If the move was somewhat mercenary, the board balanced it the following year by giving some of Sherwood's territory to the Church of St James the Less.[160]

None of these decisions solved the larger problem. Laurel Hill needed to expand or face decreasing revenues in coming years. Nathan Dunn, who had bankrolled the first land purchase, died in 1844, but the company no longer depended on him for financial support. It was prepared for another large outlay. On June 15, 1848 the managers' agent paid $13,000 for the 27-acre Harleigh estate. Over the next few years, this land would be transformed into South Laurel Hill Cemetery, and Notman's landscape became North Laurel Hill.[161]

The new parcel lay between Ridge Road and the Schuylkill, almost one quarter mile south of the cemetery. A public road, leading to a ferry landing, formed the northern boundary, while the southern border crossed a once-important route to a ford. Much of the land was a rolling slope that descended toward the Schuylkill from a plateau slightly southeast of the tract's center. A mansion on this high ground had been the home of prominent jurist William Rawle in the early nineteenth century, and it was he who dubbed the property "Harleigh." Financial hardship forced

---

[159]LHC minutes, 19 January 1844, 27 September 1844, 8 January 1845; [John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 8. Although the plan Notman drew for the *Guide* shows seven terraces, none existed at the time of publication and only three were built.

[160]LHC minutes, 22 September 1845, 7 January 1851, 5 May 1861.

[161]Philadelphia County Deed Book A. W. M. 71, p. 330. Rather than buy Harleigh outright, the company used one John F. James as an intermediary. Not until 10 May 1849 was the title officially transferred to the managers (Philadelphia County Deed Book G. W. C. 21, p. 337). For legal reasons this deed was recapitulated on 29 May 1851, Philadelphia County Deed Book G. W. C. 112, p. 341; see "Abstract of the Title to Laurel Hill," a bound manuscript at LHC.

him to sell the estate in 1816. It then passed through four other owners before Laurel Hill's managers took title. While evidence of Harleigh's mid-nineteenth-century appearance is scant, the location would still have afforded views of the river and surrounding villas like those described by English sea captain Joshua Watson in Rawle's day.[162] Like Laurel Hill, Harleigh had been shaped for use as a country seat. Yet the topography of the new purchase was less varied than the Sims estate's; it suggested a different approach to design. No competition occurred this time. Instead the managers gave the project to James C. Sidney (ca. 1819-1881), whom Smith later remembered as "a clever civil engineer from England."[163]

Smith's familiarity with Sidney's skills must have played a large part in the hiring decision. About 1845, the Englishman began working as a cartographer at the Library Company. Under Smith's guidance, he produced various maps for commercial sale, including the popular *Sidney's Map of Ten Miles round...the City of Philadelphia* (1847), which featured an inset view of Laurel Hill. The earlier of these maps were reproduced through "anastatic printing," a form of lithography that Smith and his son Robert had introduced in America. The same process supplied illustrations for the elder Smith's pattern books - works that also gave Sidney a chance to show his drafting abilities. When Smith co-authored *Two Hundred Designs for Cottages and Villas* (1846) with T. U. Walter, Sidney's drawings comprised six of the plates.[164]

By the time the cemetery company was ready to re-landscape Harleigh, Sidney had some qualifications for the task. After 1847, his cartographic work, based largely on his own surveying, continued apace. Much of it was published by Robert Smith who, with his father's help, was establishing his name as a mapmaker.[165] Meanwhile, Sidney was also trying his hand at architecture. Several of the buildings he presented in *Two Hundred Designs* appear to be his own conceptions, and he received at least one important architectural commission before 1848.

---

[162] The description of Harleigh's topography and setting is based on the above deed, as well as Hills' *Plan of the City* (1809) and Charles Ellet, Jr.'s *Map of the County of Philadelphia* (1843, showing 1839 conditions). The earliest deed to employ the name Harleigh appears in Philadelphia County Deed Book M.R. 8, p. 474 (William Rawle and wife Sarah to Isaac Cooper). Other relevant deeds are mentioned in John C. Mitchelle's "Brief of Title to a Messuage or tenement and Tract of land called 'Harleigh'..." AMsS, June 1848, located at the City Archives of Philadelphia. On Rawle, see Scharf and Westcott, 2: 1143, 1531. Joshua Watson's 1816 description of the view from Harleigh appears in Kathleen A. Foster, *Captain Watson's Travels in America: The Sketchbooks and Diary of Joshua Rowley Watson, 1772-1818* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), 293. Watson's watercolor entitled "Looking up the Schuylkill to the Mills at the Falls from the Fisherman's Hut Alphington" depicts either Harleigh or the neighboring Fairy Hill from a distance; see Foster, plate 28.

[163] John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 224.

[164] Walter W. Ristow, "The Map Publishing Career of Robert Pearsall Smith," *Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress* 3, no. 26 (July 1969): 172-82; Jefferson M. Moak, "Chestnut Hill's Architectural Heritage: James C. Sidney, Architect," *Chestnut Hill Historical Society* [Newsletter], (Summer 1983): passim; Tatman and Moss, 718.

[165] Ristow, 183-89.

Although Sidney lacked experience in landscape design, Smith considered him reasonably competent and was willing to take a chance.[166]

In January, 1849, the managers assigned the South Laurel Hill contract to Sidney. He was to receive three hundred dollars for work that Frederick Brown listed bluntly as "surveying and putting on Map." Four months later the first site plans appeared - published, appropriately enough, by Robert Smith's firm. All twenty copies of this drawing have since vanished, but contemporary maps probably contain a decent likeness. Sidney's own *Map of the City of Philadelphia Together with All the Surrounding Districts...* (1849) shows a series of concentric crescents attached to a grid - a clear, if somewhat crude, acknowledgment of the site's topography. The managers got what Brown had ordered, and little more. Nonetheless, Sidney had fulfilled his initial obligation, and collected his final payment on 28 May 1850.[167]

Work on South Laurel Hill may have helped the young surveyor recognize his limitations in the design field. For this or other reasons, he formed a partnership with architect James P. W. Neff in early 1850, and the cemetery company's last payment had gone to "Sidney & Neff." In 1854, Laurel Hill's managers again turned to the firm, apparently hoping to unstiffen and complete Sidney's original plan. The basic conception changed little, but the grids and crescents gave way to undulating lines, creating a more picturesque composition. An upper drive passed along and through the old Harleigh estate's road system, apparently retaining such formal features as an oval and a triangle that complicated the route. The lower drive was meant to join the upper at two points, but its southwestern extension remained incomplete. As a result, the road snaking the long slope lead only to a kidney-shaped loop.[168]

Visitors could gain access to South Laurel Hill from two directions. A northeastern entrance faced "the road to the ferry" or Nicetown Lane, while central and southern openings fronted Ridge Road. The latter entrance was the main one but, early on, the central gate was important too. Behind it lay the original drive to the Harleigh estate. If North and South Laurel Hill had occupied adjacent tracts, all trace of the estate might have vanished immediately; preservation was low on the managers' agenda by the 1840s. However, the cemetery company had failed to

---

[166]Sidney had little or no demonstrated ability in landscape design when he received the South Laurel Hill commission. Nonetheless, he was an adept surveyor, and had honed his drafting skills during his years at the Library Company. By 1849, the "tolerable accuracy" that Smith discerned in Sidney's early cartography had given way to the meticulousness apparent in Sidney's *Map of the City of Philadelphia Together with All the Surrounding Districts*. See John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 224; Ristow, 189.

[167]"Disbursement, Laurel Hill Cemetery South," i.e., cash book no. 1, South Laurel Hill Cemetery, ? January 1849 [date of contract unspecified] through 28 May 1850.

[168]Sidney and Neff collected their final payment on 8 December 1854 ("Disbursement...South"). By that time they had supplied the board with the impressive rendered plan that remains in the company's collection. The same year saw the end of Sidney and Neff's partnership. Following the split, Sidney moved to New York City where he helped lead Robert Smith's campaign to map New York State; Moak, 2.

convince its southern neighbor to sell. The resulting distance between Laurel Hill's halves effectively created separate cemeteries. This arrangement required a second superintendent, and the managers apparently retained parts of the Harleigh complex in order to accommodate him. Perhaps the situation also prompted some new thinking on the original superintendent's quarters. By the late 1840s, Notman's Cottage had been replaced by the gable-roofed structure shown in contemporary views.[169]

At South Laurel Hill, new construction began long before Sidney and Neff put the finishing touches on their plan. Architect John McArthur, Jr. (1823 - 1890) adorned the south entrance with a substantial sandstone gateway that reached completion in spring of 1850. Later famous for the design of Philadelphia City Hall, McArthur was just starting his career at the time. Smith probably directed him to *Two Hundred Designs for Cottages and Villas* for an illustration of the gateposts the company desired. The book also contained several patterns for classicizing lodges that may have inspired the architect. One such building stood immediately behind the gate and is likely to be the "Cottage" for which McArthur supplied a drawing. Company carpenter B. R. Marley finished work on the small, porticoed structure in late 1854.[170] As in 1836, the managers gave high priority to building a formidable front wall. The contractor, Michael Diemer & Son, employed rubblework that gave way to coursed ashlar near the main entrance, forming an exedra for visitors arriving by carriage. Above the wall and between McArthur's hanging posts rose ornate fences and gates from the well known ironworks of Robert Wood.[171]

South Laurel Hill opened for business in April, 1849. Over the next two years, lot sales concentrated in the cemetery's southern half (Sections 1-4 and 7). Section 7, located in the southeast corner, overlooked the Schuylkill and offered lot-holders some of the steepest terrain

---

[169]The neighboring Pepper family's reluctance to sell their land is mentioned in Scharf and Westcott 3: 2359. For evidence of surviving Harleigh fragments in South Laurel Hill's original scheme, compare Charles Ellet's depiction of the tract (1839) with early cemetery plans. North Laurel Hill's new superintendant's house appears in R. A. Smith, *Illustrated Guide*, 38 and Augustus Koellner's 1848 drawing of the cemetery, lithograpbed by Deroy and published in *Views of American Cities* (New York: Goupil, Vibert & Co., 1848-51).

[170]"Disbursement...South," indicates that McArthur received the gate contract in January, 1849. His considerable charge of $1425.00 "for Stone Entrances" indicates that he acted as both designer and contractor. By 2 February 1850 he had met the terms of the agreement and on 17 May relinquished his "Drawings of Gateway and Cottage" for a mere $20.00. Marley was paid "in full for Cottage," 30 December 1854. Designs resembling McArthur's appear in Smith and Walter, *Two Hundred Designs for Cottages and Villas* (Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1846), plates 5, 7, 114. On McArthur, see Lawrence Wodehouse, "John McArthur, Jr. (1823-1890)," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 28, no. 4 (December 1969): 271-83; Tatman and Moss, 510-12.

[171]Frederick Brown contracted with Diemer and Wood at the same time be hired Sidney and McArthur. Diemer finisbed the front wall in November, 1849, and returned the following spring to build the exedra. Logically enough payments to Wood coincide roughly with payments to Diemer ("Disbursement...South"). On Wood, see Scharf and Westcott 3: 2266; Wainwrigbt, *Philadelphia in the Romantic Age*, 195, 196, 243.

on the site. A "summer house" there served the same picturesque function as the one in North.[172] While Section 1 was generally "appropriated for family vaults," its northern end and part of Section 10 contained the core of the Harleigh estate. Structures there included the superintendent's house (presumably the old villa), a carriage house and an unidentified outbuilding. For practical or ornamental purposes, the superintendent also maintained a garden.[173]

As surveying and lot sales crept north during the 1850s, an important pattern began to emerge. Near the middle of the tract's eastern border, an increasing amount of land sold to religious congregations. At North Laurel Hill, Smith had learned that churches were willing to buy whole clusters of burial lots, and that the arrangement yielded monetary and symbolic benefits. With this lesson in mind, he gladly met the request of his own sect, the Society of Friends, for a "burying-spot."[174] His circa 1850 letter to an unidentified Quaker makes clear that one area of South Laurel Hill was designated for the purpose. He wrote: "I send herewith the long talked-of plan; it is not quite complete, but as regards Friends ground quite so. It will serve thy purpose for exhibition & will I trust bring some results from your friends & acquaintances etc. etc."[175] In the same document, Smith referred to "your committee," perhaps suggesting the involvement of a specific Quaker meeting (where decision by committee was the norm).

The Friends' Burial Ground occupied Section 4. In keeping with Quaker practice, it contained "no memorials or distinctions of any kind," and resembled "a little meadow" with "slightly raised mounds."[176] Although members of the Society were buried throughout Laurel Hill, unity through proximity had a distinct appeal. Wishing to grant its congregation the same privilege, Fifth Baptist Church acquired Section 6 and part of Section 11 starting in 1852. The First Dutch

---

[172]Early lot sales are recorded in "Sales Book No. 1, South Laurel Hill." As of 1852, South Laurel Hill contained ten "sections" of burial lots. Others were subsequently laid out, numbered 11 through 18; mysteriously, there was no Section 12. Though conceivably a Harleigh remnant, the summer house was probably built in the first half of 1849. Jesse Shoemaker received $23.04 for tinning its roof on 12 June 1849 ("Disbursement...South"). R. A. Smith indicates the building's location in *Illustrated Guide,* 120.

[173]Description of the superintendent's complex is based on R. A. Smith, *Illustrated Guide*, 119 and the 1854 Sidney and Neff plan. These buildings occupied the same general location as those of the Harleigh estate. Since South Laurel Hill's cash book does not list construction expenses for superintendent's accommodations, the structures are likely to be Harleigh's.

[174]John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 268.

[175] J[ohn] J. Smith, Library [Company of Philadelphia] to "Respected Friend," undated ALS, in Society Collection, HSP.

[176]R. A. Smith, *Illustrated Guide*, 121. Laurel Hill's managers continued to enforce the restrictions that gave Section 4 its distinctive character until 1887. By this time the Friends Ground had lost popularity and the conventions that governed it were impeding lot sales. See LHC minutes, 31 October 1887.

Reformed Church bought Section 13 several years later.[177] In this way, a church quarter took shape, allowing the tradition of churchyard burial limited survival in the rural cemetery.

The family lot remained a popular convention as well. Finding ground reserved for that use inadequate, the Coates family formed its own Burial Association and took title to a substantial portion of Section 9. So large was the Coates lot that it was eventually depicted in a separate plan.[178] For those of lesser means or pretensions, Section 15 contained single graves. This area lay in South Laurel Hill's northern half, parts of which remained unsurveyed well after 1860. Section 10 was still being laid out in the early twentieth century.[179] Yet if South Laurel Hill was slower to develop than its northern counterpart, it boasted monuments of comparable quality. Some of the first generation of designers even returned on new commissions. Notman, for instance, devised a diminutive Gothic canopy to enclose Joseph Maples' sculpted lamb on the tomb of Sarah Harrison; but more mass-produced work from firms like those of Maples and Edwin Greble apparently prevailed.[180] Rows of impressive mausoleums also began to adorn South's terraces.

As in previous years, John Jay Smith took charge of horticultural embellishment. The managers gave him liberty to select trees and plants, and he probably continued to determine planting locations.[181] His efforts received ample recognition. After visiting both halves of the cemetery in the summer of 1849, A. J. Downing wrote approvingly:

> Laurel Hill is especially rich in rare trees. We saw, last month, almost every procurable species of hardy tree and shrub growing there, -- among others, the Cedar of Lebanon, the Deodar Cedar, the Paulowinia, the Araucaria, etc. Rhododendrons and Azaleas

---

[177]"Sales Book No. 1, South," for years 1852 and 1854; LHC minutes, 5 January 1854, 3 October 1854.

[178]The Coates lot (Sec. 9, #58-59), appears on the 1854 Sidney and Neff plan and in various smaller plans dated as late as 1926, all at LHC.

[179]Sales Books, South Laurel Hill; C. A. W[illis], "Working Drawing of Plot in Section 10," 1921, at LHC.

[180]A de facto directory of firms that shaped Laurel Hill in mid century appears in the advertising pages of R. A. Smith's *Philadelphia as It Is* (1852). Views of Joseph Maples' and Edwin Greble's marble works are here, along with advertisements for the services of Robert Wood, John McArthur, Jr. and others - all interleaved with an essay on Laurel Hill. See also idem, *Illustrated Guide*, 120; *Stranger's Guide*, 227-28. An especially elaborate Gothic monument proposed for South Laurel Hill was Robert Wood's cast iron version of the Waltham Cross. Meant to mark the grave of Samuel Townsend, the work may have remained unexecuted. R. A. Smith expected its completion in 1852, but the *Strangers Guide* makes no reference to it nine years later.

[181]Two itemized expenditures shed light on Smith's horticultural activities at South Laurel Hill. On 6 June 1849, Thomas Stanwik [?] received $163.77 "for trees selected by J Jay Smith." Likewise, R[obert] Buist collected $4.80 "for plants ... by JJS" on 3 January 1850; see "Disbursement...South."

> were in full bloom; and the purple Beeches, the weeping ash, rare Junipers, Pines and deciduous trees were abundant in many parts of the grounds. Twenty acres of new ground have just been added to this cemetery. It is a better *arboretum* than can easily be found elsewhere in the country.[182]

Laurel Hill as National Reference Point

Downing's praise for Laurel Hill stemmed partly from his rapport with Smith and general regard for Smith's horticultural endeavors. Yet the cemetery had gained national attention well before Downing publicly extolled the virtues of the place. Since the 1830s, people had traveled from cities and towns across the United States to visit Smith's institution. They took note of the cemetery's design and location, of the plantings and monuments, of the tightly-worded regulations and of the more poetic guides. In 1849, Downing confirmed what most of his readers already knew: Laurel Hill was an American landmark and flagship of a movement.

Technically, Laurel Hill was the nation's third rural cemetery. It followed both Mount Auburn in Cambridge (1831) and Mount Hope in Bangor, Maine (1834). Only recently has scholarship unveiled the latter cemetery's place in this chronology, and that fact itself is telling.[183] Popular literature of the nineteenth century makes scant reference to Mount Hope. As far as influence and recognition were concerned, Laurel Hill was Mount Auburn's immediate successor. Next in this canonical lineage was Brooklyn's Greenwood Cemetery, established in 1838 by wealthy businessman Henry E. Pierrepont and civil engineer David B. Douglass. Douglass, who also served as the cemetery association's president, laid out the grounds along lines similar to Mount Auburn's. After several years of organizational turmoil, during which plans for a profit-earning stock company were abandoned, Greenwood opened its gates in 1842. With this institution's birth, "the grand triumvirate of America's first and most influential rural cemeteries" was complete.[184]

From the late 1830s onward, dozens of rural cemeteries began spreading across the American landscape. The phenomenon was most apparent outside Northeastern and Midwestern cities but was not limited to these regions or even to cities: many small towns and villages readily adopted

---

[182]Andrew Jackson Downing, "Public Cemeteries and Public Gardens," *The Horticulturist, and Journal of Rural Art and Rural Taste* 4, no. 1 (July 1849): 10 (n.).

[183]Pregill and Volkman, 412 (n. 3). See also James H. Mundy and Earle G. Shettleworth, *The Flight of the Grand Eagle: Charles G. Bryant, Maine Architect and Adventurer* (Augusta: Maine Historic Preservation Commission, 1977).

[184]Schuyler, "Evolution," 297. See also Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 58-59.

the new style of burial.[185] Nonetheless, it was the metropolitan examples that lead the way, setting off what Smith termed "a generous rivalry" among the nation's cultural and economic hubs.[186] Greenmount Cemetery graced the outskirts of Baltimore in 1838 and Worcester Rural Cemetery arose near Worcester, Massachusetts in the same year. Other important iterations included Harmony Grove in Salem, Massachusetts (1840), Spring Grove in Cincinnati, Ohio (1844), Allegheny in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania (1844), Hollywood in Richmond, Virginia (1847) and Oak Hill in Washington, D.C. (1848).

Sometimes cemetery founders followed Laurel Hill precedent in selecting "old country seats" for development. Baltimore's Greenmount, which rivaled the "triumvirate" for national attention, is a well known, though under-studied, example. However, sites previously manipulated for aesthetic effect seem to have been more the exception than the rule. When it came to design, several treatments were popular. They ranged from the semi-formalism of Laurel Hill to the studied naturalism of Mount Auburn, tending more toward the latter after 1845. Certain locales boasted multiple varieties. The new institution proliferated so rapidly that by 1849 Downing could write with confidence, "...there is scarcely a city of note in the whole country that has not its rural cemetery."[187]

John Notman himself did much to shape the first generation of these projects. In 1845, the reputation he had earned at Laurel Hill helped win him the commission for Cincinnati's Spring Grove Cemetery. His interest in geometry, partially evident at Laurel Hill, resurfaced in the later design, and Spring Grove's directors ultimately rejected it, claiming that it conformed inadequately to the site's topography.[188] Their objections centered on the expensive grading required to complete Notman's multiplicity of roads and paths. Incensed by his dismissal, Notman also learned his lesson. When, in 1848, he was hired to design Hollywood Cemetery in Richmond, he adopted the free-flowing, romantic lines his employers had admired at Mount Auburn. Along with this plan he submitted a lengthy report demonstrating the pragmatism and economy of his scheme. Laid out essentially as Notman intended, Hollywood impressed Richmond's elite and brought the architect more work in the city. After financial hardship and political wrangling over incorporation, the cemetery proved popular, and became a "southern

---

[185]Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 55.

[186]John Jay Smith, *Designs for Monuments*, 2.

[187]Downing, "Public Cemeteries," 9.

[188]The extent to which Spring Grove's directors carried out Notman's plan is unclear. Greiff, 28, 82, argues the scheme was at least partially complete when the directors sought the services of landscape gardener Adolph Strauch. Other scholars refer to Notman's "unused design," suggesting that the first landscape gardener to shape Spring Grove was cemetery superintendent Howard Daniels. Notman's plan is now lost, precluding comparison with later views of the landscape. See Blanche Linden-Ward and David C. Sloane, "Spring Grove: The Founding of Cincinnati's Rural Cemetery, 1845-1855," *Queen City Heritage* 43, no. 1 (Spring 1985): 23, 25; Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 75.

shrine" after the Civil War filled it with Confederate dead.[189]

Other cemetery commissions came Notman's way over the next decade. He conceived a successful plan for Lynchburg, Virginia's Spring Hill Cemetery in 1855, and probably continued to design funerary monuments for other sites.[190] Appropriately enough, his final cemetery project took shape across the street from South Laurel Hill. Here, in 1856, he placed the "dream-like" Italianate gate of Mount Vernon Cemetery, an institution that bore several professional connections to its rival neighbor.[191]

Writing for *The Horticulturist* in 1855, A. D. Gridley issued a caveat on rural cemetery layout. "The usual committee or trustees having the charge of founding a cemetery, can do no such work, nor can an ordinary land-surveyor, nor every 'old-country gardener.'"[192] Thanks, in part, to Notman's efforts, cemetery design had become a professional occupation by the mid nineteenth century. Gentlemen like Mount Auburn's Henry Dearborn still dabbled in the field, but specialists who made their living on "landscape art" increasingly took their place. The new breed came out of various disciplines. Some, including Notman and Spring Grove's Howard Daniels, identified themselves primarily as architects. Others, like James C. Sidney and Greenwood's David Douglass came from backgrounds in civil engineering and surveying. The Boston firm of Robert Morris Copeland and Horace Cleveland had prior experience in scientific farming. Although the concept of landscape architecture had not yet been articulated, cemetery commissions provided a mainstay for the nascent profession. Through his early work at Laurel Hill, John Notman had done much to establish this precedent.[193]

If Laurel Hill helped Notman set a standard of professionalism in landscape gardening, it also benefitted his career in several more tangible ways. His design for the cemetery's

---

[189]Greiff, 28-29, 142-45; Mary H. Mitchell, *Hollywood Cemetery: The History of a Southern Shrine* (Richmond: Virginia State Library, 1985), 12-34.

[190]Notman's funerary art tends to adorn the cemeteries he designed. The pattern is documented at both Laurel Hill and Spring Grove; see Linden-Ward and Sloane, "Spring Grove," 27.

[191]Mount Vernon's treasurer was Robert Buist, a Scotsman who had emigrated to the America on the same ship as Notman. Since that time, Buist had risen to prominence as a florist, seedsman and landscape gardener whose customers included Laurel Hill Cemetery. His familiarity with Notman probably brought Notman the gateway commission. Another defector from Laurel Hill was B. R. Marley, who served as carpenter for both institutions. See Grieff, 39, 215-17; U. P. Hedrick, *A History of Horticulture in America to 1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1950), 248.

[192]A. D. Gridley, "Rural Cemeteries," 280. See also John Jay Smith, "Rural Cemeteries," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 6 (August 1856): 347, and [Patrick Barry], "Rural Cemeteries," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 3 (July 1853): 299. Although some important cemetery designers had trained as surveyors, these articles show how specialization attached a stigma to that title in landscape gardening circles.

[193]Pregill and Volkman, 402, 407.

superintendent's quarters apparently impressed company president Nathan Dunn. While Notman was still busy at Laurel Hill, Dunn hired him to create a similar building, "The Cottage," which served as Dunn's summer house in Mount Holly, New Jersey. More importantly, the cemetery project won Notman the allegiance of John Jay Smith, who became the architect's liaison to A. J. Downing. When Downing's 1841 *Treatise* established his national voice in architecture and landscape gardening, the book also featured two Notman designs. One was Dunn's Cottage, the other Bishop George Doane's New Jersey estate, Riverside. In all likelihood, Smith smoothed the way for this debut. He may even have produced a drawing of Riverside that formed the basis of the published illustration.[194]

The examples of Notman's oeuvre that Downing placed in the *Treatise* showed the Scotsman to be a capable architect and manipulator of landscape. To emphasize the point, Downing went on to describe Notman as one of two skilled practitioners of "rural architecture" in America - the other being Alexander J. Davis. Thus forged, Notman's connection to Downing was lasting. Downing's later publications featured other Notman designs, and the two men collaborated on the ill-fated scheme for Spring Grove Cemetery.[195] By the time of Downing's death, in 1852, Notman had long since come into his own. He had conceived the Athenaeum and St. Mark's Church in Philadelphia, and was at work on Richmond's Capitol Square; he had earned national recognition for his handling of the Gothic and Italianate modes; he was a leading purveyor of Anglophilic design. Notman's talent made these achievements possible, but his early contact with Downing had contributed significantly to his rapid ascent.

The associations with Laurel Hill and Downing that aided Notman's career also provided a boost for Smith. After Downing's demise, Smith eventually succeeded him as editor of the popular *Horticulturist* (1855-59). It was an obvious position for Smith to seek, given his knowledge of plants, his friendship with Downing, and his periodic contributions to the journal Downing had founded.[196] The other arena in which Smith became a respected spokesman was cemetery

---

[194]Greiff, 61-68. The drawing in question once belonged to *Treatise* illustrator A. J. Davis and is now located at the Henry F. duPont Winterthur Museum. It bears the initials "J. S.," which, according to Jane Davies, "may stand for John [Jay] Smith, the known point of contact between Downing and Notman." If this attribution is correct, the drawing is among the strongest pieces of evidence placing the start of the Smith-Downing correspondence before the publication of the *Treatise*.

[195]Downing, *Treatise* (1841 ed.), 347; Greiff, 79-80, 165-66, 227, 235. "A Cottage in the Italian or Tuscan Style" is the only positively identified Notman work to appear in a Downing publication (*Cottage Residences*, Design IX) during Downing's lifetime. However, designs that Downing published without attribution, such as that for Camac House, may well be Notman's.

[196]Another task that readied Smith for *The Horticulturist* was his editing of Francois Andre Michaux's *The North American Sylva* (1850-51). Once ensconced in Downing's post, Smith immediately took pains to associate himself publicly with his deceased predecessor; see "The Editor to the Reader," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 3 (July 1855): 298-99, and the three-part series "Downing's Familiar Notes and Letters," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 6 (January, February, April 1856).

management. Building on Laurel Hill's reputation, he marketed himself as both author and consultant. His *Designs for Monuments and Mural Tablets* (1846) contained a "Preliminary Essay on the Laying Out, Planting and Managing of Cemeteries," which, if not especially original, constituted the only major American treatise on the subject. His case-specific advice also became a valued commodity. Many years after the fact, he described with relish how the backers of New York's Greenwood and Woodlawn Cemeteries approached him when their fledgling institutions were struggling. Referring to Greenwood's Joseph Perry, Smith wrote, "Mr. Perry adopted, as all the successive cemeteries have done, my original regulations, mostly in my own words...adding, however, other rules as necessity dictated."[197] This claim doubtless exaggerated the extent of Smith's influence, but its basis lay in fact. He had become management consultant to the burial business.

The 1840s were a period of standardization in rural cemetery establishment and administration. Starting with Massachusetts, several states passed laws that set forth uniform criteria for cemetery incorporation. A cemetery company's tax status, land ownership rights and board membership were all governed by the new legislation.[198] Other states continued to deal with these questions on a case-by-case basis. Whatever the dictates of state or local law, cemetery companies still needed guidance on the smaller details of operation. Here, as Smith asserted, the regulations of Laurel Hill (and Mount Auburn) provided the model.

A policy practiced at Laurel Hill but not specified in the regulations also proved popular elsewhere. After brief periods of operation, cemetery administrators discovered that not all lot-holders were equally committed to maintaining their property. The cemetery's infrastructure also required care which the lot-holders could hardly be expected to provide. Smith and his colleagues had anticipated this problem. Early on, they had established a trust called the Permanent Fund, to be used "for the preservation in good order and embellishment of the ground for Interment ... and of the general inclosures [sic], buildings, roads and walks."[199] Derived from lot sales, this reserve insured that the overall appearance of the site would not fall victim to the vagaries of multiple ownership.

As Smith showed the nation how to run a rural cemetery, the institution multiplied with startling speed in his own city. Downing believed there were "nearly twenty" rural cemeteries around Philadelphia in 1849, and that local expenditure on these projects had totaled more than $1.5

---

[197]John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 292. Beyond sharing Laurel Hill's regulations, Smith prohahly recommended business techniques he had successfully employed in Philadelphia. Greenwood's policy of marketing lots to churches may be one such horrowed tactic. See Remes, 54; Marion, 67.

[198]Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 66.

[199]Philadelphia County Deed Book G. S. 1, p. 460 (30 May 1839). LHC records show that the Permanent Fund was set up in 1836. Mount Auhurn did not enact a similar policy until 1843; see Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 71.

million by that time.[200] One of the first such ventures was De L'Amerique Pere La Chaise, or The American Pere La Chaise. The institution was founded in 1837 by Dr. John Elkinton, an outspoken critic of urban burial. Its rather unoriginal name suggested the internationalism of the rural cemetery movement and conflicted with the same movement's requisite patriotism. Therefore, after several years, "the managers determined to erect a conspicuous monument to the memory of Washington and Lafayette and, in allusion to that fact, changed the name of the ground to Monument Cemetery."[201]

The spate of cemetery building that ensued over the next decade or so left Philadelphia in a position to rival all other cities in this category. Woodlands Cemetery (1840) was followed by the Franklin (1840), Lebanon (1849), Olive (1849), Odd-Fellows' (1849), Glenwood (1850) and American Mechanics' Cemeteries (1849).[202] The last three institutions were located just over a mile southeast of Laurel Hill and were more or less directly affiliated with the Independent Order of Odd Fellows.

Sometimes people and ideas that had surfaced at Laurel Hill reappeared locally. For instance, Laurel Hill surveyor Philip M. Price, laid out Monument Cemetery, while Glenwood's plan resembled the one conceived by Notman. However, the cemetery with the most marked (though unacknowledged) similarities to Laurel Hill was, unquestionably, Woodlands. The Woodlands Cemetery Company was founded in 1840 by a group of Philadelphians lead by Eli K. Price. Among the other "associators" was Philip M. Price, Eli's brother. The land they purchased for their venture was The Woodlands, the famously picturesque estate of William Hamilton once coveted by Laurel Hill's founders.[203]

Following a trip to Mount Auburn, Greenwood and other cemeteries, the Price brothers returned to redesign Woodlands. Their plan shared with Laurel Hill's a careful integration of existing site features, notably Hamilton's mansion, carriage oval and entrance road. At the center of the tract, they placed a geometrically divided circle, akin to Notman's Shrubbery, from which meandering paths radiated. Some of these similarities stemmed from the sites' parallel histories - a circumstance shared also with Greenmount. Yet Philip Price's prior work at Laurel Hill is too obvious a connection to ignore. Later developments also indicate that Woodlands' managers

---

[200]Downing, "Public Cemeteries," 9.

[201]Scharf and Westcott, 3: 1873; Torchia, 12-19.

[202]Scharf and Westcott, 3: 2359-60. Many of these cemeteries appear in exceptional detail on *Smedly's Atlas of the City of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1862). A comparison between this map and Sidney's *Map of the City of Philadelphia* (1849) conveys some sense of the rapidity with which rural cemeteries proliferated around the city.

[203]Long, 196-98. Monument Cemetery was planned on a grid. The only obvious similarity to Laurel Hill was geometrical central node, also a feature of Woodlands Cemetery.

kept their eyes on their neighbor across the Schuylkill. They solicited the services of T. U. Walter and John Notman during the 1840s, and perpetuated the pattern in the next decade by hiring John McArthur, Jr. Four years after designing South Laurel Hill's entrance gate, McArthur received the same opportunity at Woodlands.[204]

There were also remarkable similarities in the two institutions' policies and administrative structures. Pursuing the established route, Eli K. Price's group obtained a state-sanctioned charter explaining the cemetery's *raison d'etre* and promising "security against encroachments upon the dead." Once in operation, the new company actively sought the remains of war heroes and religious congregations. African-American burial was prohibited, lot treatment regulated (no enclosures higher than four feet etc.), and a "permanent improvement fund" established.[205] Woodlands Cemetery's Adamesque architecture and romantic landscape were considerable assets indeed. Nonetheless, it was partly through imitating Laurel Hill that the Woodlands garnered a share of the older institution's immense popularity.

Mediating Mass Appeal

The throngs of visitors who arrived at Laurel Hill's gates after 1840 came for various reasons. Victorian America's hospitals, asylums, penitentiaries and cemeteries were the great tourist attractions of their day, and Philadelphia boasted some of the finest examples. For those intent on examining the new spaces and systems of reform, traveling to Laurel Hill was a must. The cemetery was a sanitary solution to a perennial urban problem, but it was also much more. It promised to uphold the ideals of family and community in the face of adversity; it established rigid social order amidst seemingly unstructured surroundings; it gave public access to private estates. But, perhaps most of all, it delivered digestible doses of nature, art, history and religion - enormous entertainment - under the pretext of piety. The wonder was not that Laurel Hill was popular but that it continued to function smoothly.

From the outset, John Jay Smith and his colleagues had tacitly encouraged visitation. Visitors were, after all, prospective lot-buyers, and generally provided good publicity. Yet admittance had always been selective, carefully governed by *Regulations* that excluded non-lot-holder carriages and shut out the public on Sundays. The latter rule, based on Mount Auburn's, limited Sabbath day admission to funeral-goers and to lot-holders who had obtained company-issued tickets.[206] As the tourist flow increased, the managers began to elaborate these policies.

---

[204]Ibid., 200-04, 211-16, 233-35, 279-80. As at Laurel Hill, the limitations of Philip Price's design role at Woodlands are not entirely clear. He performed the duties of surveyor, but company minutes indicate Eli Price had as much influence on the overall scheme.

[205]Ibid., 197-98, 205-12, 219, 226, 263-67.

[206][John Jay Smith], *Regulations* (1837), 3-4. Mount Auburn's regulations, in place by 1834, handled these issues somewhat differently. The Sunday admission policy was essentially the same as Laurel Hill's, but throughout

Troubled by a rise in disorderly conduct, they officially banned picknickers in 1844 and considered further clamp-downs on carriage access. Nothing came of the latter initiative, but others were on the horizon. In November, 1847 the board adopted a more restrictive weekday visitation policy. Effective New Year's Day, 1848, Laurel Hill was closed to all sight-seers without prior approval. "[C]itizens and strangers" who wished to tour the premises would now have to obtain tickets like those issued to lot-holders, distributed by Smith and Brown from their downtown offices. As a commercial guidebook later explained, "The object of this regulation is to prevent the admission of improper persons."[207]

Despite its strong wording, this new impediment failed to dissuade the curious masses. Their appeals to Smith and Brown must have met with some success, for "nearly 30,000 persons... entered the gates between April and December, 1848."[208] No one recorded the number of rejected requests, but apparently it was substantial. Smith later recalled, somewhat gleefully, the measures the company took to control the resulting pandemonium: "two men made a good support by watching the numerous horses hitched outside, while two other stalwart men were required to take tickets at the gate, and keep out those not fortunate in getting admissions in the city."[209]

An important factor behind this human surge was the rise of public transportation. Laurel Hill had always been accessible by horse or coach. The trip from downtown Philadelphia via Ridge Pike took about forty five minutes - not much longer than a cross-town jaunt according to Smith's optimistic estimate. By 1852, an omnibus was taking passengers as far as Fairmount, still a considerable distance south of the cemetery.[210] However, the last years of the decade witnessed the grading of Ridge Avenue, and the establishment of the Ridge Avenue Rail Road. This system, based on horsecars, greatly facilitated ground transportation. While some visitors continued to savor the adversity of the traditional pilgrimage, most probably shared the

---

the week the managers used tickets to limit lot-holder carriage traffic. See Rotundo, "Proper Boston Institution," 271-72; idem, "Fortunate Coincidences," 260.

[207][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 43; McDannell, 283-84; LHC minutes, 19 January 1844, 26 November 1847; R. A. Smith, *Smith's Illustrated Guide*, 37-38. The 1844 minute records that driving privileges were "liable to abuse from others than lot-holders," suggesting that the prohibition against non-lot-bolder carriages was lax. The cemetery gained increased protection through an anti-vandalism act passed by Pennsylvania's General Assembly in 1847 and reprinted in subsequent editions of LHC's *Guide*.

[208]Downing, "Public Cemeteries," 10. By 1860 Smith estimated annual visitation at "upwards of 140,000;" see [Gridley], "Cemeteries," 606.

[209]John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 255.

[210][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 14; R. A. Smith, *Illustrated Guide*, 31-32. Zuk, 19, claims that stagecoacbes (or perhaps omnibuses) made three daily trips from Philadelphia to Laurel Hill but does not specify the time-frame of this service.

sentiments of Sidney Fisher. Describing his journey to the funeral of an acquaintance, Fisher noted, "The funeral started from Mr. Rush's house at 11, but I preferred going out to Laurel Hill in a passenger car to a slow drive thro heat and dust in a carriage. The cars are very airy & comfortable. Got to Laurel Hill at 1/4 to 12. The funeral did not arrive till 1 1/2, being ordered to proceed at a *slow* walk."[211]

An older alternative to carriage travel was the steamboat. These slow, serene vehicles began plying the Schuylkill on a regular basis during the 1840s. By the following decade, the *Washington, Mount Vernon* and *Frederick Graff* embarked hourly on a circuit between Fairmount and the Falls of Schuylkill, disgorging a stream of lot-holders and sightseers at Laurel Hill (Fig?).[212] While several landings may have served the cemetery, the main one lay at the end of Nicetown Lane, South Laurel Hill's upper border. A landing in the same general location had been the eastern terminus Garrigue's (later Mendenhall's) Ferry since the mid eighteenth century.[213] Visitors arriving here by steamboat doubtless appreciated the scenic journey but faced an arduous uphill trek along Nicetown Lane before reaching either of Laurel Hill's main gates. This drawback was one of several cited by veteran steamboat operator Caleb S. Wright in a plaintive letter addressed to Smith shortly after horsecar service began.

> Since the Ridge Avenue Rail Road have [sic] commenced running, we have been almost entirely deprived of the Laurel Hill passengers, their landing, and receiving passengers, directly at the Gate, every ten minutes, and carrying them at a lower fare than the Boats, gives them a very great advantage.
>
> While the visitors to your Cemetry (a large portion of which is lot holders,) by the Steamers are compelled to walk, over a rough, and unpleasant road of about 1/2 a mile (made recently much worse by

---

[211]Fisher, 330 (3 August 1859). Here Fisher unwittingly ecboes the narrator in Nathaniel Hawthorne's "The Celestial Railroad" (1843). In this satyrical tale, a modern-day pilgrim seeks to avoid the rigors described in John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* by taking a train to the Celestial City. After arriving at the end of the line, the traveler realizes his sbortcut has actually led him to damnation. Hawthorne's scathing parody of the progressive rbetoric surrounding modern Christianity and technology expresses the same sort of skepticism embedded in T. D. Woolsey's critique of Laurel Hill. On "The Celestial Railroad," see John F. Kasson, *Civilizing the Machine: Technology and Republican Values in America 1776-1900* (New York: Grossman Publishers, 1976), 49-50.

[212]Foster, pl. 27. An illustration of steamboat service to Laurel Hill appears in Edward Strahan (Earl Sbinn), *A Century After: Picturesque Glimpses of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: Allen, Lane & Scott, and J. W. Lauderbach, 1875), 140.

[213]See Scharf and Westcott, 3: 2145; Birch, pl. 15 ("Mendenghall Ferry" [sic]); "Mendenhall's Ferry on the Scbuylkill River at Laurel Hill," (unidentified newspaper), 25 October 1908, a clipping filed in the Campbell Collection, HSP. It is unclear whether this system was the same as that described in Central Laurel Hill deeds as "Robert's or Wallace's ferry."

> the grading of the Ridge and the operations of the Rail Road Company,[)] this with the fact of the Steamers leaving the wharf but once an hour, is the cause of the falling off.[214]

Hoping to regain a competitive edge, Wright proposed rebuilding "the old wharf opposite the 'Round House'" - apparently the main landing. He further suggested enclosing the area and erecting a riverside gate, "to be attended by a person appointed by yourselves" whose salary Wright offered to subsidize.

Smith was unmoved. Responding with characteristic coolness, he explained:

> My wish and that of the other managers was from the first to provide a quiet resting place for the Dead; that so many of the living should be attracted to it was unexpected, though flattering to our efforts to make it attractive, was not desired by us. When the boats began to run we feared that too many for the proper repose of the place would be brought out, but the experiment worked rather better than we feared, & we have thus far allowed the rules to remain unaltered, though we should have been glad if fewer persons had been admitted. We feel the same fear now in regard to the Rail Road, & have made more stringent regulations respecting the tickets being given out. If we see anything like desecration or overcrowding, we shall make further regulations which will exclude all but lot-holders & friends in their company, & a few strangers & others permitted as a special favor, & I fear it will come to this ere long. To increase the facilities on the river because new ones have grown up on the Road would not attain our object of greater seclusion.[215]

These words were somewhat disingenuous. When founding Laurel Hill, Smith and his collaborators were well aware of Mount Auburn's popularity; their institution's tourist appeal was neither "unexpected" nor undesired. Nonetheless, Smith's response nicely illustrated his company's predicament. By the mid nineteenth century, the lures that had made Laurel Hill a success were working too well. The company had all the business it needed, and could rest upon its reputation to sell lots. The main priority now was to protect "the interests and sacred feelings

---

[214]Caleb S. Wright, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to John Jay Smith, [Germantown, Pennsylvania?], ALS, 21 July 1859, at LHC; underlining in original text.

[215]John Jay Smith, Germantown, Pennsylvania, to Caleb S. Wright, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, ALS, 21 July 1859, at LHC.

which surround these hallowed grounds."[216]

In the Cause of Parks

In 1843, J. C. Loudon had referred to rural cemeteries as places of "contemplative recreation."[217] Several years later, the phrase might have struck the managers of Greenwood, Laurel Hill and Mount Auburn as a contradiction in terms. America's largest rural cemeteries were overrun with sight-seers and pleasure-seekers. "Guidebooks in hand, they admired the monuments and the artistic planting and the views. They wandered along the lanes and paths, and rested on the expanses of lawn, sketched, ate lunch and even practiced a little shooting. They had discovered a kind of recreation that the city had never offered."[218] Smith and his counterparts in other cities thus had genuine cause for alarm. The "reverential atmosphere" they had struggled to create was under siege.

Loudon had foreseen this possibility and outlined ways to avoid it. He felt strongly that picturesque design gave cemeteries "too great a resemblance to pleasure grounds;" simplicity and formality were preferable.[219] Had Americans followed his advice, their cemeteries might have assumed a "distinctive" character, less conducive to casual visitation. But the picturesque was firmly entrenched, and the consequences were not entirely negative. As Downing observed, Mount Auburn, Laurel Hill and their progeny were "the first really elegant public gardens or promenades formed in this country... Hundreds of the citizens who ramble through them, form perhaps, their first acquaintance with many species of plants there, and apply the taste thus acquired to their own gardens."[220] This was a promising pattern, and one worth encouraging. Smith evidently thought so, for he reprinted Downing's observation in the 1844 *Guide*. The goal, then, was to transplant rural cemeteries' leisure function to a location where it might flourish

---

[216]Ibid. An entry in South Laurel Hill's first Cash Book appears to undermine Smith's claim of early disdain for steamboat service to the cemetery. On 8 September 1853, the company paid E. Suttswood sixty dollars "for Frame...at Steam Boat Landing." Sometime after rejecting Wright's proposal, the company may have acceded to his wishes. The minutes of 2 June 1874 refer to repair work on the "entrance near the steamboat landing." On the proposition that rural cemetery founders were surprised by their institutions' recreational appeal, see Bender, 196; Sears, 100.

[217]As quoted in Curl, *A Celebration of Death*, 253.

[218]John Brinckerboff Jackson, "The American Public Space," *Public Interest* 74 (Winter 1984): 57. See also Linden-Ward, "Strange but Genteel Pleasure Grounds," passim.

[219]John Claudius Loudon, "The Principles of Landscape-Gardening and of Landscape-Architecture applied to the Laying out of Public Cemeteries and the Improvement of Churcbyards...," *Gardener's Magazine* 19 (1843), 149, as quoted in Schuyler, "Evolution," 301. See also Curl, "Early British Cemeteries," 242-44.

[220]Andrew Jackson Downing, "Additional Notes on the Progress of Gardening in the United States," *Gardener's Magazine* 17 (March 1841), 146-47, as quoted in Schuyler *Apostle of Taste*, 190 and [John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 155-56.

without adverse effect. Downing's words, eagerly repeated by Smith, became the seeds of America's crusade for urban parks.

During the late 1840s, Downing refined and amplified his argument. He decried rural cemeteries' "gala-day air of recreation," while extolling their influence on public sensibilities. With Laurel Hill in mind he asked readers of *The Horticulturist*:

> If 30,000 persons visit a cemetery in a single season, would not a large public garden be equally a matter of curious investigation? Would not such gardens educate the public taste more rapidly than anything else? And would not the progress of horticulture, as a science and an art, be equally benefitted by such establishments?[221]

As these lines suggest, the rhetoric of rural cemeteries transferred almost seamlessly to the parks. Like cemeteries, "rural parks" were billed as vital to the public's physical and mental well-being. Both institutions supposedly counteracted the harmful influences of urban life and both would ultimately improve the "national character." Public gardens might lack family monuments, historic relics and religious overtones, but their natural amenities were still capable of purifying the baser, more mercenary elements from the American soul. Much of Loudon's language regarding the didactic value of cemeteries seemed applicable too. Parks could be model displays of horticulture and landscape gardening; they could improve "the moral sentiments and general taste of all classes, and more especially of the great masses of society."[222]

Smith and other rural cemetery promoters had long echoed such paternalistic proclamations in reference to their own institutions. Yet the ideology underlying this eloquence fitted parks more snugly. Rural cemeteries seemed to uphold a democratic ideal: admission was free, religious affiliation did not affect lot sales, the antiquated rules of the graveyard were no more.[223] In practice, however, "brotherhood in wealth" was the principle of admission, just as T. D. Woolsey alleged. Lot prices precluded interment of poor families, regulations denied purchase rights to minorities, and the same groups had only limited access to the premises. Even lot-holders themselves could not ignore the ways in which social distinctions were made manifest on the landscape. Within the cemetery's confines, some lots were small and virtually unadorned while others boasted ornate fences, lush plantings and massive monuments. Boosters and romantics to

---

[221]Downing, "Public Cemeteries," 11.

[222]Ibid., 10-12; idem, "A Talk about Public Parks and Gardens," *Horticulturist and Journal of Rural Art and Rural Taste* 3, no. 4 (October, 1848): 157; Loudon, "Principles of Landscape-Gardening," 93, quoted in John Jay Smith, *Designs*, 6, and paraphrased in [idem], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844 ed.), 16; Jackson, 60-61; Tatum, "Emergence," 38, 41. On the rural cemetery as inculcator of morality and taste, see also Gridley, "Rural Cemeteries," 279; Bender, 198; French, 46, 52; Sears, 88, 100, 107, 109; Thomas, 37.

[223]A. D. Gridley vehemently promulgated these arguments in "Rural Cemeteries," 606-07.

the contrary, rural cemeteries were at once exclusive *and* hierarchical.[224] While parks might not banish the specter of hierarchy, they at least represented genuine public space. The significance of this difference was not lost on Downing, who used a mock dialogue in *The Horticulturist* to comment, "With large professions of equality, I find my countrymen more and more inclined to raise up barriers of class, wealth and fashion, which are almost as strong in our social usages, as the law of caste is in England."[225] A major point in favor of parks was their ability to ease class strife.

In concept and in law, Laurel Hill was private. Nonetheless, the cemetery represented an important phase in the evolution of local public space. Philadelphia's earliest landscaped parks had been limited in scale and design ambition; that adjoining the Fairmont Waterworks was probably the most successful. Larger and more elaborate pleasure grounds were located on private estates which, with the exception of Henry Pratt's Lemon Hill, remained closed to the masses throughout the first third of the nineteenth century. When Lemon Hill changed hands in the mid 1830s, sight-seers were barred there too. Luckily, this development coincided with Laurel Hill's birth, allowing one semi-public estate to assume the other's role. A tradition of public access, maintained at the waterworks and lapsed at Lemon Hill, thus continued to stretch northward along the Schuylkill River's eastern bank.[226]

Philadelphians flocked to Laurel Hill and partook of its pleasures, but they missed Lemon Hill. In 1843, City Councilor Thomas Cope perceived an opportunity to make Pratt's garden something it had never been before: public property. Such an acquisition would not only supplement the small park at Fairmount but also help avert the riparian industrialization that was rapidly polluting Philadelphia's water supply. With some citizen support, Cope composed the necessary legislation. City Councils approved it, and by 1844 Lemon Hill fell within the public domain. Unfortunately, no clear or well-financed plan accompanied this purchase, so the site became, in John Jay Smith's words, "the loafing place of rowdies and disreputable characters."[227] Only in 1855 did the City officially reclaim the property and designate it a public park. Even then the change was largely semantic, but it brought the name "Fairmount Park" into being.

Over the next few years, the movement to establish an urban park commensurate with the size and needs of Philadelphia's population gained momentum. John Jay Smith's active participation in this cause was no coincidence. Failing to heed Loudon's injunction, he had created a park-like, romantic cemetery and watched tourists throng to it. Now he wished to displace the recreational element - the well-being of city and company seemed to depend on it. When it came

---

[224]Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 53-54, 83-90; Sears, 104, 111, 116.

[225]Downing, "A Talk about Public Parks," 155.

[226]Maria F. Ali, "Fairmount Park," Historic American Buildings Survey PA-6183 (1995): 4-7.

[227]John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 292.

to displaying art and nature in the name of public good, Smith was a veteran. In addition to his work at Laurel Hill, he served as treasurer of Peale's Philadelphia Museum and consorted with various civic-minded landscape "improvers" in Downing's circle. The line between his social ambitions and his interest in "the instruction of my countrymen" sometimes blurred. Referring to a plan to import exhibits from the 1851 World's Fair, he wrote, "The first idea I had in relation to it was, I may say, that the popularity of the scheme, both here and in England, would enable me to visit Europe under such auspices as would introduce me to the men of mark abroad; and underlying this was the utility to America."[228] But, whatever Smith's motives, he possessed skills and connections valuable to any initiative concerning landscape, public health and cultural betterment.

By the 1850s, New York had largely eclipsed Philadelphia as the cultural capitol of the United States. However, in the category of parks, Smith still held out hope. Understanding his city to be "the geographical and climactic, as well as the horticultural centre of the Union," he rebuked his fellow citizens when work moved forward on Central Park. "Will it be believed, by future generations, that twelve years have elapsed since the great city of Philadelphia purchased ground for a park...?" he asked *Horticulturist* readers in August, 1856.[229] The following year he took action. Lawyers James H. Castle and Charles S. Keyser wished to extend Fairmount Park by acquiring the Sedgeley estate, located just north of Lemon Hill. Both men were tenants of the Library Company, where Smith had served as Librarian, and they approached him hoping that "Downing's successor could accomplish what Downing was supposed to have done [for Central Park]." Aware that his stature was no match for his predecessor's, Smith obliged. During the early months of 1857 he helped Castle and Keyser formulate a fund-raising strategy, an activity in which Laurel Hill surveyor Philip Price also participated. Although Smith later wrote cynically of this crusade, his letters suggest his involvement was passionate enough at the time; even in retrospect, he was proud of securing a twenty-thousand-dollar donation from Councilman Thomas Cope's sons. By June, 1857, Castle and Keyser had obtained Sedgeley, and Smith announced their success to his readers.[230]

Despite such gains, it was clear by 1859 that Philadelphia would not have "*the* Park." Smith essentially conceded as much, but he still felt his city surpassed New York in terms of park location. The qualities that had drawn him to Laurel Hill were just as pronounced down river,

---

[228]Ibid., 168-71, 255, 258-59.

[229]John Jay Smith, "Editor to the Reader," 299; idem, "Editor's Table," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 6 (August 1856): 386.

[230]John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 292-95; idem, "Editor's Table," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 7 (February 1857): 100; idem, "Editor's Table," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 7 (June 1857): 280; letters among Smith, Castle, Keyser and Price, two dated January, February 1857, the rest apparently from same period, filed under Castle's name at HSP. By this time, Castle had condemned the City's neglect of Lemon Hill in his pamphlet "Lemon Hill in Its Connection with the Efforts of Our Citizens and Councils to Obtain a Public Park," (1856).

and he understood all too well the allure Schuylkill River estates held for the public. Converting these lands to park use would require some dexterity, but a designer familiar with Philadelphia's traditions and topography could handle the task. Late in the previous year, eight firms had competed for the high-profile commission. Smith knew some of the competitors personally and discussed the site with at least one; this was William Saunders, whose essays Smith had published in *The Horticulturist*. However, in March, 1859, city councilors awarded the contract to James C. Sidney. What influence, if any, Smith had in the decision is unclear. But he presumably derived satisfaction from seeing the "clever civil engineer" of South Laurel Hill adapt another section of villa landscape for a broader civic function.[231]

Over the next two decades, Fairmount Park would grow exponentially. Much of the credit for orchestrating this effort belonged to Woodlands Cemetery founder Eli K. Price, who, like Smith, had looked on anxiously as his institution began to function as a park. Heading the Fairmount Park Commission's land acquisition committee, Price bought up hundreds of acres west and north of the old park. This land ultimately dwarfed the area Sidney designed - a sort of metaphor for his career. After working at Laurel Hill, he had enjoyed increasing success in architecture and landscape design. Rural cemeteries were among his specialties (he dotted New York and Pennsylvania with them) but Fairmount Park represented his professional peak. He took on Bronx, New York's massive Woodlawn Cemetery in 1863, conceived a number of schools and houses, then slipped into total obscurity.[232]

Although their careers followed different trajectories, J. C. Sidney had much in common with John Notman. Both came from Britain with relatively modest skills, made good at Laurel Hill, and went on to design estate grounds, cemeteries and parks along the Eastern seaboard. In so doing, both men had helped build foundations of American landscape architecture. Paralleling this maturation of a profession was the rise of picturesque public space. Private estates inspired semi-public cemeteries which, in turn, sewed the rhetorical and professional seeds for public parks. Laurel Hill and the Woodlands illustrated the process in microcosm. In Laurel Hill's case, this historical linkage was also writ large on the urban fabric of Philadelphia: the cemetery lay between old country seats to the south and vast tracts of new parkland to the north.

---

[231]John Jay Smith, "Editor's Table," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 8 (July 1858): 329; idem, "Editor's Table," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 9 (February 1859): 92; Michael J. Lewis, "Who Designed Fairmount park?," TMs, 1998. My thanks to Professor Lewis for sharing his research with me.

[232]Long, 285-96; Sloane, 92; Jefferson M. Moak, "James Charles Sidney: Works," TMs, 1987, kept at the City Archives of Philadelphia; my thanks to Mr. Moak for maintaining and sharing this list. In an 1881 obituary, the editor of *Gardener's Monthly* commented, "Mr. Sidney's death affords a lesson of how soon a man's brilliant services may be forgotten by a whole community. Few men possibly had more influence on the architectural or rural beauty of Philadelphia in the very recent past than Mr. Sidney, but so far as we know, the daily press of Philadelphia has passed over his sudden death in a few lines notice...;" *Gardener's Monthly and Horticulturist* 23, no. 270 (June 1881): 193.

Design and Construction, Phase III and IV

Before Fairmount Park's heyday or the start of the Civil War, Laurel Hill began another phase of growth. The cemetery's fragmentation into discontinuous parts had not hurt business, and South Laurel Hill's sloping lots sold steadily throughout the 1850s. Early in the decade, however, some question seems to have arisen regarding the company's right to own or develop its southern annex. To end all doubt, managers obtained a new deed and secured from the state's General Assembly an act permitting even greater expansion. Instead of the sixty acres specified in the original charter, the company could now own up to one hundred, provided they lay west of Ridge Turnpike between Alleghany Avenue and Huntingdon Street. This move cleared the way for connecting Laurel Hill's two halves, but the necessary land was still unavailable. Instead the managers turned north. In early 1855, they bought Frederick Stoever's ten-acre tract, sandwiched between North Laurel Hill and the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad (in fact, slightly north of Alleghany). Converting this property for interment proved simple enough. The site was small and relatively flat, so the managers opted to extend North Laurel Hill's post-Notman path grid. The carriage road was also a continuation of the older plan; it terminated in a centrally located cul-de-sac.[233]

In 1861, the larger opportunity arrived. Addressing his fellow managers on January 15th, John Jay Smith announced:

> The intervening property between North and South Laurel Hill and known as Fairy Hill, the property of the late George Pepper, I am happy to say we have procured...It consists of 21 1/2 acres, a portion of it is meadow and this will require careful and judicious treatment to bring it into Cemetery Lots but the importance of the whole tract as a connecting link to our previous grounds, is so great that we have conceded very favorable terms to the heirs, rather on public than private considerations.[234]

The property in question evinced the same land-use patterns as older parts of the cemetery. Once part of the farm from which Joseph Sims' Laurel Hill had been carved, it included a substantial

---

[233]City of Philadelphia Deed Book R.D.W. 9, p. 205 (20 February 1855); "Abstract of the Title to Laurel Hill." The latter source dates the Act of Assembly to 14 April 1851, while reprints of the act in LHC's *Guides* are dated 1852.

[234]LHC minutes, 15 January 1861; City of Philadelpbia Deed Book A.C.H. 24, p. 181 (29 June 1861). The "favorable terms" were largely the same as those accorded Frederick Stoever. In both cases, the grantor received half of all proceeds from lots sold on his land (after 10% had been subtracted for the Permanent Fund) and the guarantee that lots in any subsequently purchased land would not be sold for another decade. The company's special concession to Pepper's executors was a promise to pay them $3,000 annually from 1862 until 1864 "as an advance upon future sales." On similar arrangements during this period, see Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 131.

house known initially as "Fancy Hill." Patrician George Pepper owned the estate from 1813 until his death in 1846, and was, perhaps, responsible for changing the name to Fairy Hill.[235] A founder of the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, he had summered at Fairy Hill and sometimes displayed it to other members of the Society. The land's topography essentially mirrored that of South Laurel Hill, but in reverse: rising from a swail in the southeast, it peaked on the same ridge that gave North Laurel Hill such dramatic views, then dropped abruptly down to the Schuylkill. Pepper and his heirs had either permitted or cultivated dense natural growth. This circumstance concerned Smith who, in his address to the managers, continued, "This new plot is mostly overwooded and will require judgement and attention to bring it to public success. It is believed that this can be done economically by the aid of not more than two additional regular hands, the usual enclosures, surveys, walks and some little judicious planting in the meadows, etc."

Exactly how this work moved forward at first is unclear. Some of the company's 1860s accounting records are missing and would, presumably, shed light on the clearing process. Major projects must have included the demolition of Pepper's house and outbuildings, grading, the thinning of trees, and the filling of a stream that ran diagonally across the site's southeastern half. Other work was postponed until mid decade, probably because the terms of the Stovever purchase precluded lot sales in subsequently acquired land until 1865. Attribution for Central Laurel Hill's layout is also vague. Although the company may have hired a professional landscape designer, most evidence suggests otherwise. When discussing plans for the tract, Smith repeatedly emphasized the need for economy and his belief that existing staff could handle the bulk of the work. At the same time, he himself received a temporary salary increase of one thousand dollars to compensate for the additional effort the project would require of him. The only surviving pre-survey plan for Central Laurel Hill is a rough, unsigned sketch, apparently in Smith's hand.[236]

Because Pepper's property joined Laurel Hill's parts, certain aspects of the design program were predetermined. Several carriage drives would have to run north-south, and their locations should cause as little disturbance to older sections of the cemetery as possible. Still, some destruction was inevitable. North Laurel Hill's southern boundary fence was removed, and the 1836 plan's easternmost path (Section M) was widened into a road. The latter adjustment disturbed graves,

---

[235]Sources chronicling Fairy Hill's ownership and appearance include George Vaux's "Brief of Title to 'Fancy Hill,' purchased by Dr. P[hilip] S[yng] Physick of Thomas M. Willing" AMsS, 28 August 1810, and "Abstract of Title to 'Fairy Hill' or 'Central Laurel Hill'" AMs, [1861?], both located at the City Archives of Philadelphia; Mutual Assurance policies for the Thomas Willing estate, January 1803, at HSP; William Carleton Watts, "Some Notes on the Early Family History of the Peppers of Philadelphia" TMs, July 1948, excerpt at LHC; 1843 Ellet map. On George Pepper, see also Scharf and Westcott 1: 620.

[236]LHC minutes, 15 January 1861, 21 April 1864; undated, untitled sketch at LHC. The sketch anticipates the eastern half of Central Laurel Hill's road system with some accuracy.

uprooted trees, and made retaining walls necessary in the old entrance court.[237] The new road bifurcated before reaching the Pepper tract, then traveled south in a large, uneven loop around the tract's high-ground. Two roads crossed the lower half of the site. One, forming an S curve, led to South Laurel Hill, while the other fell in a straight line that approximated the old stream bed. Much of the path system consisted of a grid, the major axis of which followed the high, western ridge. Within the main carriage loop, three circles, or *rond-points,* added focus and formality to the whole. Appropriately, the largest circle seems to have marked the site of Pepper's house.

Griffith M. Hopkins provided the maps that allowed this construction to proceed. Like J. C. Sidney, Hopkins had been part of "a small army of survey-inclined civil engineers" whom Smith's son Robert had led toward successful careers in cartography.[238] Ultimately, Hopkins would make his name through county maps and city real estate atlases, but smaller projects sustained him before that time. During the mid 1850s, he picked up where Sidney left off at South Laurel Hill, and laid out the nearby Mount Vernon Cemetery. He seems to have been most active at Central around 1865.[239]

Whatever Hopkins' skills, other services would be needed to make the cemetery's seventy-nine acres operate as a unified whole. Connecting Central and South Laurel Hill proved particularly problematic. Any artery between the two sections would have to cross Nicetown Lane (Hunting Park Avenue), and though a small road to the east made the crossing at grade, the arrangement was awkward. Perhaps inspired by the "separation of ways" at Fairmount or Central Park, the managers chose to isolate cemetery traffic on a bridge. Contractors Dolan & Shields built the triple-arched granite span between 1864 and 1865.[240] When complete, it ran from the end of Central's loop (an area once known as Mary Whites Hill) to the midpoint of South's lower drive. Finally, visitors and grounds-keepers could travel from one end of the cemetery to the other on internal roads. The other advantage of a bridge was security. Open gates invited trespassing, an activity that undermined one of the cemetery's basic functions. To further suggest their institution's impregnability, the managers placed massive castellated towers at the intersection of Ridge Avenue and Nicetown Lane. These structures resembled older ones in front of North

---

[237]HSR 62, 90-91.

[238]Michael P. Conzen, "The County Landownership Map in America: Its Commercial Development and Social Transformation 1814-1939," *Imago Mundi* 36 (1984): 14-17..

[239]"Disbursement..South," 1855-57; "Day Book [no. 1]" i.e., combined casb book for all Laurel Hill accounts, 1865-67; Greiff, 215.

[240]"Day Book," 1864-65; Scbuyler, *New Urban Landscape,* 105. Although the managers continued to pay Dolan & Shields after 1865, an entry for 4 May of that year mentions work on the bridge's parapet, suggesting later payments were on old debt. My estimate of the cemetery's size is based on LHC minutes, 15 January 1861. The 10 acres remaining east of Ridge Avenue are not included in the count.

Laurel Hill.[241]

Although traffic could now circulate smoothly through the cemetery, the size and layout of the grounds made central oversight difficult. The problem was not a new one. Following South Laurel Hill precedent, the company decided to provide accommodations for a third superintendent. He would live and work in Central, just east of the bridge, in a solid, church-like stone cottage. The simple Gothic Revival design came from R. Morris Smith, an architect whose work had appeared frequently in *The Horticulturist* while his cousin John Jay Smith was editor.[242] Like the landscape it overlooked, the building did not resemble its counterparts to the north or the south. Age, of course, accounted for some of these differences. But Laurel Hill's managers seem to have intentionally maintained distinctive aesthetic and administrative identities for the three sections.

Central Laurel Hill's distinctiveness was evident from the beginning. The plan was simpler and less picturesque than any the company had previously adopted, not counting the perfunctory treatment of Stoever's small parcel. Roads curved more gently; paths did not curve at all. South Laurel Hill had been a step in this direction, but the scheme Hopkins mapped was less intricate. As lots sold off in the post-Civil-War era, their treatment followed new patterns too. Lot fences decreased in number, granite monuments multiplied, and planting thinned.

Some of these changes may have related to the "landscape lawn plan" that was beginning to exert national influence on cemetery design. Pioneered by Adolph Strauch at Cincinnati's Spring Grove, the new approach amounted to a victory for what Downing termed the "Beautiful." Instead of designs that stressed ruggedness and variety, Strauch favored undulating expanses of lawn, low monuments and more selective planting. This reaction to mid-century "clutter" was far reaching: Smith and the other managers would certainly have been aware of it.

Yet much of what was new in Central had older origins. For years Laurel Hill's *Regulations* had warned against impermanent materials such as iron and marble. By 1849 Downing had begun to attack lot-owner's taste for "hideous *ironmongery*," and as other critics joined in, they cited moral objections as well: high lot fences and large monuments posed an overt threat to the communitarian ideal rural cemeteries were supposed to uphold. Strengthened by landscape-lawn rhetoric after 1855, these arguments seemed to validate the polite paternalism Laurel Hill's managers had so long expressed toward lot-holders. Only the company could fully appreciate the "*toute ensemble.*" Why, then, should superintendents not gain greater control over the

---

[241]"Day Book," January - May. These entries record payments to mason John Monaghan for building the tower at the northeast tower of South Laurel Hill. The matching tower in Central was probably built 1861-64.

[242]"Day Book," August 1867 - September 1868; Moss and Tatman, 740-41.

cemetery's appearance?[243]

Many cemetery companies answered this question to their own satisfaction during the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Laurel Hill did not, perhaps, pay more than passing attention to Adolph Strauch's planning principles, but the managers did heed landscape-lawn era administrative trends. Over a year in construction, Central Laurel Hill's superintendent's house attested to his importance. In 1864, the managers also increased the power of superintendents, giving them the right to remove all "unsightly or inconvenient" plantings and "any structure whatever" deemed "injurious to the appearance of the surroundings." Later in the century, iron railings were officially banned.[244]

The cemetery's post-1850 approach to planting is not well documented. In 1856, John Jay Smith wrote a series of articles on plant and building materials appropriate to cemeteries in which he sounded several familiar themes. Evergreens, for instance, continued to be "essential." At the same time, he made new effort to distinguish between species befitting the cemetery as a whole and those suited to individual lots. Detailed lists of both varieties accompanied one article. Whether Smith, his company or lot-holders acted on this advice is unclear.[245]

As for taste in monuments and lot enclosures, the evolution was unmistakable. Instead of iron fences and gates, granite copings and corner posts sprang up. Posts were favored by management because they facilitated mowing, an activity made easier but more necessary by the advent of the lawn mower. In monument design, the pagan iconography maligned by moralists and aesthetes decreased somewhat, only to reappear in new form: while broken columns subsided, larger columns capped by angels multiplied. Central Laurel Hill's Clothier and Kirkpatrick tombs were particularly conspicuous examples. Obelisks made a comeback too, inspired partly by 1870s efforts to complete the Washington Monument. A phenomenon with less precedent was sculptural representation of the deceased. Joseph Bailly's statues of William Cresson and William Hughes adorned the Central and Stoever tracts, and marked some of the earliest uses of bronze in the cemetery. E. Kornbau's marble sculpture of William Mullen (in South) was a vivid Victorian mix of piety and self-congratulation.[246]

The announcement of individual and family wealth became an increasingly important function of

---

[243]Downing, "Public Cemeteries," 10; [Barry], 299; Gridley, "Rural Cemeteries," 281-82; [idem], "Cemeteries," 610-16; French, 51-52; Schuyler, "Evolution," 302; Linden-Ward and Sloane, 27-31; Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 88-112.

[244]LHC minutes, 1 October 1864; *Rules and Regulations* (1892), 19.

[245]John Jay Smith, "Rural Cemeteries," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 6 (August-October 1856). The best late-nineteenth-century description of Laurel Hill's horticultural treatment appears in Strahan, 143-44 .

[246][Gridley], "Cemeteries," 616-17; Scharf and Westcott 3: 2266; Thomas, 38-39, 43.

funerary art during the Gilded Age. Monuments stretched ever-higher, and mausoleums set new standards of extravagance. For the most part, these tendencies did not worry Laurel Hill's managers. Their job was to sell lots, not promote humility. But they did wish to maintain order and, in 1879, they finally exercised their right to block construction interfering with the "general effect." Hugh Craig's heirs owned a lot in Central, not far from the bridge, and wished to build a large mausoleum there. The proposal outraged the owner of an adjacent lot. Not only did the mangers intervene, they also added a clause to the regulations stipulating that mausoleums could stand "only in such portions of the grounds as are set apart for that purpose."[247] This statement articulated a policy long observed informally: the cemetery would be divided into neighborhoods.

Differences in lot size and price had always fostered social stratification in Laurel Hill's landscape. Before 1860, the Shrubbery had been choice turf for the elite, and mausoleums clustered along terraces in North and South. At the other end of the economic spectrum, small groups of single graves accommodated "strangers." Institutional zones formed another category: churches owned territory in several sections, while Girard College and the Pennsylvania Institution for the Instruction of the Blind had their own lots. The late nineteenth century's contribution to the pattern was to make class divisions more blatant.

In 1877, tool manufacturing magnate Henry Disston bought a prominent lot in the southwest corner of Central Laurel Hill. His massive mausoleum received his remains the following year, and for two decades thereafter Philadelphia's millionaire industrialists built mausoleums in the area. Just north, giant columns and obelisks lined the ridge, filling the formal circles there. In this way, parts of Central Laurel Hill became concentrated displays of opulence unlike any the cemetery had witnessed before.[248]

Beyond the Walls

As the outlines of Laurel Hill's "neighborhoods" grew clearer after 1850, the cemetery's own environs were undergoing a less ordered transformation. A landscape still dotted with taverns, farms and a few large estates now showed clear signs of industry. The Richmond Branch of the Reading Railroad had passed north of Laurel Hill in the early 1840s, delivering coal to factories at the Falls of Schuylkill, and another set of tracks ran along the river's western bank. At first, cemetery managers were not troubled by these developments: the 1844 *Guide* even mentioned the optimal vantage point from which to view railroad bridges. But modern wonders were best

---

[247]LHC minutes, 2 May, 30 August 1879. For a brief period, the managers also placed tight construction controls on a newly cleared section of North; see LHC minutes 28 January 1887, 2 April 1888. On the phenomenon of mausoleum building, see Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 221-25.

[248]"Sales Book No. 1, Central Laurel Hill;" Quinn, 224-26; Ames, 639, 651, 653; Sears, 104-05, 111-14. For other examples of institutional lots in Philadelphia, see Long, 290-91.

seen from afar, where they could be dissociated from encroaching urbanity. In 1852, the author of a popular guidebook spoke enthusiastically of watching the train from Laurel Hill: "Over one hundred cars, attached to a single engine, is [sic] frequently seen flying along; the shrill whistle and tumultuous noise of which startle the stranger in this otherwise quiet and sequestered neighborhood;" if the cemetery itself were to be engulfed by Philadelphia's "living tide," it would not be for another century.[249]

By the time these words appeared in print, Laurel Hill's managers had erected worker housing east of Ridge Road. The company also began renting space in cemetery buildings, and could claim a total of eighteen tenants by 1861. Some of the occupants worked at the cemetery. Others may have made the short northward commute to the Falls of Schuylkill Woolen Mills, founded six years earlier and specializing in carpet manufacture. In any case, the character of the area was changing. Maps drawn up after Philadelphia's 1854 consolidation showed the urban grid extending to Laurel Hill's borders. Many of the streets still existed only on paper, but grading and paving lay in the foreseeable future.[250]

Another pattern appeared just as clearly on maps of this period. Philadelphia's Twenty-First Ward, in which Laurel Hill fell, was riddled with cemeteries; it was, in fact, a sort of unofficial cemetery quarter. John Elkinton's Monument Cemetery had sprung up a respectful two miles from Laurel Hill in 1837. Later cemeteries edged closer, moving northwest along Ridge Avenue. Odd Fellows and American Mechanics' (1849) were followed by Glenwood (1850), Mount Vernon (1856), Mount Peace and German Lutheran cemeteries (1860s?), the latter three lying just east of Laurel Hill. These institutions grew in clusters, each ringed by the services needed to support it. Ridge Avenue was a natural location for monument manufacturers because it lead directly to Pennsylvania's "marble and lime stone quarry country" in Montgomery County. But other industries took root too. Marble yards, florists and nurseries all flourished within the microeconomy of the funeral business.[251]

Some of the new cemeteries served only the groups that founded them. Others were open for public business and directly rivaled Laurel Hill. While the decision to treat North, Central and South Laurel Hill as semi-autonomous ventures had certain book-keeping advantages, it was also

---

[249][John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill* (1844), 8, 11, 14; R. A. Smith, *Illustrated Guide*, 28, 35-36; Bender, "'Rural' Cemetery Movement," 206-07; McDannel, 285; Warner, 198.

[250]LHC minutes, 15 January 1861; *The Manufactories and Manufacturers of Pennsylvania of the Nineteenth Century* (Philadelphia: Galaxy Publishing Co., 1875), 52-53; *Smedley's Atlas* (1862). A street grid was projected on the area by the late 1840s; see Sidney's *Map of the City* (1849).

[251]Scharf and Westcott 1: 693, 3: 2360; R. A. Smith, *Illustrated Guide*, 37; idem, *Philadelphia as It Is*, 332-42; *Stranger's Guide*, 228-30; G. M. Hopkins, *City Atlas of Philadelphia*, (Philadelphia: G. M. Hopkins & Co., 1875); Donald C. Jackson, "Roads Most Traveled," 225. Various cemetery-related industries lay further south on Ridge Road. They included the marble works of J. & M. Baird and Arthur O'Keefe, and Robert Wood's iron works.

an attempt to keep pace with competition: newcomers might imitate Laurel Hill, but the institution could replicate itself from within. By the mid 1860s, the strategy showed promise. A nearby cemetery, probably Mount Vernon, was going bankrupt and seemed ripe for takeover. Addressing the "second generation" of managers shortly after Frederick Brown's death, John Jay Smith spoke with guarded optimism. He recounted Laurel Hill's gradual rise to success and noted the expanding geographic reach of the company's patronage even as "imitators are suffering economic collapse."

> For a very long period of our Cemetery history, Germantown for instance afforded but two or at the most three lotholders [;] now Laurel Hill may be said to be the burial place of the best class of inhabitants of that increasing suburb. Manayunk stood entirely aloof for a very long period but it is now a good purchaser. Montgomery County too is coming in, attracted by the beauty and the order of the sacred spot.[252]

In Smith's somewhat self-serving view, genteel entrepreneurship had been key to Laurel Hill's endurance.

> It was a fortunate circumstance that in America, the Management of the best Cemeteries fell in to the hands of gentlemen and not into those of speculators, undertakers, etc. because the former could afford to wait for the results and forestall by improper haste or forcing those sales which can only be made in proportion to the regular demand.

However, Laurel Hill's future was not guaranteed. Unlike newer companies which invested all profits in "improvements and embellishments" for their grounds, Laurel Hill had only limited means for this work.[253] Steering the course "between excessive adornments and narrowness of expenditure" would be crucial.

When Smith set out this caveat he was probably thinking of the Pepper tract. At the same time, he clearly envisioned future purchases. One was the unnamed "Cemetery on the East," the other a stretch of "ground on the South." The size and location of the latter parcel are uncertain; a nineteenth century source mentions "forty acres...nearer the city."[254] Whatever the specifics,

---

[252]LHC minutes, 21 April 1864.

[253]The newer type of cemetery company flourished between 1840 and 1860; investor-driven stock companies increased thereafter. See Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 130.

[254]Watson, *Annals* (1927 ed.) 3: 139.

Laurel Hill's managers had reason to believe their land holdings would soon increase.

By 1869, these hopes dissolved. Not only had the anticipated takeover fallen through, but the Fairmount Park Commission had also seized the southern addition through eminent domain. Perhaps in compensation, state legislators passed an act allowing the company to buy six acres directly south of the cemetery. However, the Park Commission soon made other demands. It aimed to extend East River Drive (Kelly Drive) past Laurel Hill, and left the Committee on Land Purchases and Damages to sort out the details. After a failed bargaining attempt, Laurel Hill received $12,000 for the four-acre right-of-way. The involvement of Land Purchase Committee Chairman and rival cemetery proprietor Eli K. Price could only have strained the proceedings. At long last, Laurel Hill had lost the ability to expand.[255]

John Jay Smith had always been interested in the commercial potential of rural cemeteries. Recalling in autobiographical notes his youthful business acumen he wrote, "The first sales at Laurel Hill were made this year [1836], and, adding them to my other profits from mental exertions, without embarking a single dollar of capital, my income was large for those days."[256] More recently, he had been instrumental in promoting another important rural cemetery: New York's Woodlawn. Unlike Laurel Hill, Woodlawn was organized as a stock company. Its founder, Absalom Peters, turned to Smith in the early 1860s, hoping for entrepreneurial advice, and Smith had helped rally investors around Peters' plan. Since then, Smith had watched his own Woodlawn shares skyrocket in value. When Laurel Hill's financial prospects dimmed at the end of the decade, he had a new model to follow. In 1869, he bought land on the other side of the Schuylkill and set up the stock-based West Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

There was some precedent for this course at Laurel Hill. The cemetery's founders had long profited from lot sales, and later arrangements made sellers of the Stoever and Pepper tracts de facto investors too. The novelty of post-Woodlawn cemeteries like West Laurel Hill stemmed, firstly, from their overtly entrepreneurial aims and, secondly, from their exploitation of railroad access. West Laurel Hill lay in Lower Merion township, near the Reading Railroad's Pencoyd Station; early brochures advertised "Funerals by Rail." In plan, West Laurel Hill resembled the rolling landscape-lawn scheme J. C. Sidney had designed for Woodlawn. By, 1870 the company

---

[255]LHC minutes, 20 May 1869, and quotations from "Report no. 17 of the Commissioners of Fairmount Park," in same. The cemetery hired civil engineer Casimir Constable to clarify the boundary along the right-of-way. In June, 1869, he produced a series of detailed linen maps and a written description of his findings; see Casimir Constable, Pboenixville, PA, to the President and Corporation of Laurel Hill Cemetery, ALS, 2 June 1869, filed with Constable's drawings at LHC; "Day Book," 11 June 1869; extensive set of related documents once owned by the Fairmount Park Commission and now in the City Archives of Philadelphia.

[256]John Jay Smith, *Recollections*, 101; see also 103, 291, 334.

had added seventeen acres to its original 88, and planting proceeded under Smith's supervision.[257]

Although West Laurel Hill had managerial ties to its namesake, the two institutions were, in effect, competitors. Smith and other managers knew this rivalry and the extension of Fairmount Park boded ill for Laurel Hill, but resolved to put a good face on the situation. Referring to East River Drive, the cemetery's 1872 *Rules and Regulations* stated, "The road opens fine views of the rocky and variegated water front, and superb sites for vaults and tombs, will be prepared on the eminences. The Park drive along the Schuylkill at Laurel Hill, will then resemble the Appian Way leading out of Rome...." Elsewhere, the booklet mentioned "The advantages possessed by North, Central, West, [and] South Laurel Hills," implying a set of synonymous interests.[258]

Amid professions of optimism, cemetery managers spent money with increasing caution. Faced with municipal charges for paving Ridge Avenue, they subdivided what land they still owned east of the thoroughfare and systematically sold it off. Responsibility for laying sidewalks along the avenue also fell to the cemetery, at staggering cost. Maintenance standards within the grounds slipped. Roadbeds disintegrated and retaining walls bulged; the decline was so apparent that local newspapers began taking note. In 1874, John Jay Smith resigned from the company, ending his tenure of almost forty years. Thereafter, a period of rebuilding commenced.[259]

The work was arduous, expensive and, at times, heavy handed. In keeping with the cemetery's traditional priorities, walls received attention almost immediately. Since 1869, the managers had recognized the need for a "river wall" isolating their institution from East River Drive. Quarrying for the project began in 1874 and construction continued, off and on, for more than two decades. The grading of Ridge Avenue disturbed the cemetery's eastern walls. These were partially rebuilt during the mid 1870s, at which time one of the original castellated towers was demolished. At South Laurel Hill, there was added incentive for this work: the northern and eastern walls stood beyond the legal boundaries. Managers attended to this expensive mistake. They also opted to rebuild the wall between South Laurel Hill and the park "in a sightly manner."[260]

---

[257]Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 129-31; Rotundo, "Fortunate Coincidences," 257-58; Watson, *Annals* (1927 ed.), 3: 139; Pamela W. Fox, "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: West Laurel Hill Cemetery" (1991), 8: 1-3.

[258]*Rules and Regulations* (1872 ed.), 8-9.

[259]LHC minutes, 7 March, 18 November 1872, 8 October 1873, 4 April 1874. The cemetery's condition in 1874 and subsequent remodeling are discussed in a letter from Frederick Brown [Jr.] to Laurel Hill's Board of Trustees, 13 May 1887, transcribed in LHC minutes of same date.

[260]River wall: LHC minutes, 29 August 1873, 26 February, 31 October 1874, 13 May 1887, 1 June 1888, 10 June 1895, 4 October 1897; 30 January, 22 October 1901, 24 April 1904; 27 June 1904. Ridge Ave. wall, North Laurel Hill: LHC minutes, 30 June 1874, 31 August, 30 November 1875, 31 March 1882, HSR, 62. Ridge Avenue wall, South Laurel Hill: LHC minutes, 29 February, 1 June 1876, 31 January, 31 August, 31 December 1877, 13

Within the cemetery, construction of an elaborate system for road and path drainage required "thousands of feet of pipe." Nor was water the only problem. Some roads had been paved with "coal ashes and coal dust which when pulverized by passing carriages were distributed over marble monuments by each breeze that came, when there was no rain and when rain prevailed, turned to very annoying mud." A re-paving campaign, perhaps focused in South Laurel Hill, was the solution; better retaining walls also made for safer passage.[261]

In the same period, managers reconsidered the cemetery's need for buildings. First they decided to demolish a house in which Nathan Dunn's widow had apparently been living. Then they assigned the same fate to the older of two superintendent's quarters in South. Planning for new buildings also got underway. Commercial greenhouses arose in Central, perhaps replacing defunct ones in and across from North. While this step indicated the company's growing interest in selling its own lot adornments, the privilege of monument sales still belonged to others: the marble yards of Thomas Delahunty expanded along the eastern side of Ridge Avenue by 1875.[262]

As Laurel Hill's infrastructure evolved, so did the company's image. Among the most important policy reversals of the post-Smith era was the decision to de-emphasize the separate identities of the cemetery's parts. The process was gradual, but its motivation clear. When Smith stepped down, the tile of President passed to manager Frederick Brown [Jr.]. In February, 1876 Brown learned of a forthcoming guidebook to Philadelphia that contained "at least two important errors." The book implied that Laurel Hill and West Laurel Hill were under common management, and that tickets for both were available at Brown's downtown drugstore. In an angry letter, Brown spelled out the implications to the Board:

> These mistakes are naturally very likely to injure the Company of which we are Trustees as they would, if left uncorrected, confirm in the public mind the idea that that [newer] Company is merely a branch or successor of this, which its use of our very well-known name is, under all circumstances, likely to create. The adoption by that Cemetery Company of a name so like our own as to seem to be the same (the prefix of 'West' seeming naturally to supplement our own sub-titles of North, South and Central) makes it necessary for us to be particularly on our guard, lest the Company, whose interests we have in trust, should on that account suffer

---

May 1887. Nicetown Lane and south wall, South Laurel Hill: LHC minutes, 13 May 1887.

[261]Drainage system: LHC minutes, 8 April, 30 June, 29 July 1874, 13 May 1887. Internal roads and retaining walls: LHC minutes, 31 October 1874, 28 February 1878, 13 May 1887.

[262]Demolition: LHC minutes, 2 June, 31 October, 1 December 1874, 30 November 1875. Greenhouses: 29 September, 1 November, 30 November 1875, 31 August 1877. Delahunty: Hopkins, *City Atlas*, 1875; LHC minutes, 30 October 1880, 31 December 1890.

detriment.[263]

Later developments validated Brown's fears. In 1878, an entrepreneur named Charles Sidney (perhaps J. C. Sidney's son) tried to establish an *East* Laurel Hill. Lloyd Smith, a manager at both the cemeteries his father had founded, sent an urgent note to Brown, who responded sarcastically, "The Sidneys have the same right to the name 'East Laurel Hill' as you have to 'West Laurel Hill,' i.e. none at all." Sidney's scheme failed, perhaps on its own accord. However, the following year, Mount Vernon Cemetery attempted to adopt the same name. This time Laurel Hill's managers took formal action. They also deleted all directional prefixes from the *Rules and Regulations*.[264]

For practical reasons, the company continued to administer each section separately. The three superintendents stayed on, prepared to "keep time books of the men, ...measure and lay out lots and oversee and do all the work which comes in." Around 1875, superintendents in North and South were given one-room, board-and-batten offices. These buildings isolated the men's business activities from their living quarters but were too small for any additional use. In the following decade, managers demolished the (1840s) superintendent's house in North, transferring its functions to Notman's gatehouse and equipping the latter with kitchen additions. The move freed up prime burial space and was part of a larger program: the Gothic chapel was next to fall. By 1886, the whole building cluster north of The Shrubbery was gone. Graded and readied for interment, the area retained a token trace of its past in the name Chapel Section.[265]

The creation of Chapel Section revealed the company's tight financial constraints. Another clue was the contemporaneous decision to move Central's greenhouses. The new structures arose close to their old location but "nearer Ridge Ave. where the land is low and unsaleable for burial purposes." Revenue from the sale of plants and new lots helped subsidize another round of wall construction. The most spectacular work occurred in North, where a team of more than a dozen workmen used a crane to lower great granite blocks in front of River Section. The result was an ashlar retaining wall that loomed over East River Drive. As this project reached completion in 1895, a second effort to rebuild walls along Ridge Avenue and Nicetown Lane edged forward.

---

[263]Frederick Brown, Philadelphia, PA, to the Trustees of Laurel Hill Cemetery, ALS, 29 February 1876, at LHC, and transcribed in LHC minutes of same date; punctuation modified.

[264]Lloyd P. Smith, Philadelphia, PA, to Frederick Brown, [Philadelphia], ALS, 18 May 1878; Frederick Brown, Philadelphia, PA, to [Lloyd P. Smith, Philadelphia], ALS, 18 May 1878; both letters at LHC; LHC minutes, 11 June 1879. Also in the company's collection is a copy of the 1872 *Rules and Regulations* with handwritten revisions for the 1879 edition.

[265]Offices: LHC minutes, 31 May, 30 November 1875, 12 September 1897; 17 October 1899; photographs at LHC. The original location of North's office is unclear. The building was moved to Central for use as a waiting room at the Ridge Avenue streetcar entrance in 1899. South's office initially stood in Section 4 and was moved to the main (south) entrance in 1897. Chapel Section: LHC minutes, 2 April 1883, 3 June 1884, 4 February 1885, 8 January, 21 October 1886. Gatehouse alterations: HSR, 62, 91.

The last 1830s tower disappeared, but formal entrances for vehicles and pedestrians now graced the northern side of Nicetown Lane.[266]

The Twentieth Century

Referring to Laurel Hill, the author of an 1878 guidebook proclaimed, "The step from the resting place of our dead to the pursuits of the living is but a span, though, as I have intimated, the 'merry hum of the spindle' scarcely reaches the garden of sepulture." Within two decades, even this cautious wording would seem out of date. Dobson's carpet factory had expanded, and brick row houses overlooked paved streets directly in front of the cemetery; statements dismissing the "approach of active business or private dwellings" as improbable were quietly omitted from company literature. Between 1880 and 1930, the area east of Schuylkill Falls became a dense working- and middle-class neighborhood. Mills and row houses clustered together, along with bakeries and shops. Though mostly white, the population represented a mix of ethnicities, nationalities and religions: Irish and Italians, Germans and Poles, Jews and Catholics all filled the ward.[267]

As urban life hemmed in the rural cemetery once and for all, visitation patterns changed. Most visitors were now lot holders or funeral goers instead of tourists. By the turn of the century, they ceased arriving by steamboat. Some came by rail, but a small station at the northeast corner of the grounds was short-lived: trains never did for Laurel Hill what they had done for its western namesake. In 1898, managers officially moved to allow bicycles through the gates. Ultimately, though, the future of transportation lay in the automobile. It would have the strongest impact on the institution's physical form.[268]

Year after year, the company paved internal roads with increasingly hard materials. Cars traveled slowly, negotiating curves designed for carriage traffic, but picked up speed outside the walls. After World War I, managers opted to demolish the stone towers at Nicetown and Ridge, citing interference "with the view of drivers of automobiles." This was a short-term solution to a larger problem. Traffic jams grew worse at the intersection until finally, in 1947, public officials took action. With state assistance, the City transformed Nicetown Lane (renamed Hunting Park

---

[266]Greenhouses: LHC minutes, 3 June 1884, 4 February 1885, 19 February 1890, 13 June 1892; Franklin Fire Insurance Survey No. 63865, 23 April 1885, at HSP; photos at LHC. Walls: 10 February, 13 June 1892, 10 June 1895, 26 October 1896, 4 October 1897, 8 March, 14 June 1898, 17 October 1899, 10 January 1900; photograph of River Section wall, May 1895, at LHC. Gates: plan and estimate from contractor William McCloy, 18 May 1898, at LHC; "Day Book," 22 June 1898.

[267]Frank H. Taylor, *The Valley of the Schuylkill and Its Attractions* (Philadelphia: Jas. W. Nagle, 1878), 6; *Rules and Regulations* (1879 ed.); Warner, 197-99.

[268]LHC minutes, 8 March 1898, 7 July 1922; *Rules and Regulations* (1898 ed.), 2; plan of the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad's Laurel Hill Station, stamped "Frank H. Keisker, Architect," undated, at LHC.

Avenue) into a high-speed underpass, running between thick concrete retaining walls. South Laurel Hill lost a sliver of land in the process.[269]

Laurel Hill's slow shift from sales company to maintenance company continued, with the usual consequences for architecture. In 1899, workers demolished R. Morris Smith's stone cottage in Central. The move left more burial space and marked the end of the three-superintendent system. Managers then transferred Central's records to North Laurel Hill's gatehouse, where many dwindling functions ultimately came to rest. Each time, a new round of remodeling occurred. Massive changes in the mid 1910s created more living space, a conference area, and a fireproof room, the latter features made necessary by the closing of the company's downtown offices. John McArthur's frame cottage was cleared from South Laurel Hill sometime after 1920.[270]

The cemetery had always provided temporary accommodations for the dead. Various small buildings served the purpose staring in the 1830s. But around 1912, Conkling Armstrong Terra Cotta Company furnished plans for an unusually formal and elaborate "receiving tomb." The new design allowed for social stratification. Standing in South Laurel Hill, just west of the bridge, the windowless structure housed ventilated crypts along both sides of a central hallway. In the event of "emergencies and delays," remains could be stored here up to three months for a mere five dollars. This was the low-cost alternative. Families seeking greater "seclusion" for their dead could obtain one of four private mausoleums, equipped with "massive doors" that opened onto the building's Doric portico. Rent in these spaces ran twenty five dollars per month.[271]

Greenhouses also grew in size and complexity. As of 1907, they featured a showroom. While some lot holders presumably appreciated the wider selection, others may have seen it as an ominous sign. West Laurel Hill banned "outside gardeners" in the same year, reserving all planting rights to company. Although twentieth-century lot holders rarely maintained the adornment rituals of their Victorian counterparts, many had hired private gardeners and were loathe to give up the arrangement. In 1913, Laurel Hill moved to follow West's policy. Angry letters poured in and a heated court battle ensued, lasting throughout the mid 1910s. Managers ultimately lost the case, but their control over lots continued to tighten in other ways. They had, for instance, moved into the business of crypt and vault construction, advertising the work through glossy booklets. Other literature openly stated the price of lots in each section, further

---

[269]LHC minutes, 6 February 1924; "Underpass to Eliminate Traffic Bottleneck," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 2 March 1947.

[270]LHC minutes, 20 September 1898, 17 October 1899, 13 December 1912, 10 January to 26 September 1913, 23 April 1915, 18 May 1917; HSR, 88-103.

[271]LHC minutes, 29 September 1911, 20 July 1913; four undated drawings from Conkling Armstrong Terra Cotta Co., at LHC; *Mausoleums for Rent* (1916 pamphlet); *Special Care of Lots, Endowments, Bequests* (1917 pamphlet).

highlighting the distinctions between "neighborhoods."[272]

In keeping with national trends, the size and grandeur of monuments diminished. A few neo-classical designs appeared, with historian Henry Charles Lea's North Laurel Hill tomb marking the high-style end of the spectrum. The Blabon mausoleum in Central evinced a second Egyptian Revival; bas-relief on Lillie Keim's nearby tomb acknowledged l'Art Nouveau. More prevalent in the early twentieth century were rustic forms resembling furniture, logs and boulders. Low, unadorned tablets set in later on. As for plantings, some lot holders availed themselves of great palms and ferns which the company offered for funerals. On a year-round basis, adornments tended to be simpler: smooth lawns, small flower beds, and ivy borders were common. Maintaining this neat appearance took work. Cemetery managers encouraged the establishment of endowments for "Perpetual Care," but, lacking this plan or the outside gardener's touch, lots frequently fell into disrepair.[273]

Conclusion

After the Second World War, Laurel Hill entered a period of slow but steady decline. A few areas remained open for burial, but they were generally too modest or too expensive to interest most buyers. At the same time, other sources of revenue proved inadequate. The original "Permanent Fund" could no longer cover the cost of grounds maintenance, and later endowments were restricted to individual lots. War-era scrap drives carried off some lot fences. Others fell in the name of mowing convenience or simply out of neglect. Marble monuments weathered poorly; old plantings died. The problems John Jay Smith had foreseen a century earlier posed an ever-harsher reality.[274]

By the 1970s there was some cause for optimism. Driven more by curiosity than by the search for post-mortem real estate, Americans once again visited rural cemeteries. Scholars pointed to Laurel Hill's early role in a national movement, and tour groups came to see the sculptural and architectural legacies of the Victorian age. Early landscape features were harder to discern. The Shrubbery, for instance, was devoid of shrubs; original trees had all but vanished, and paths often lay invisibly beneath sod. Despite drastic alterations, John Notman's gatehouse still conveyed its original effect. But financing posed a continuing problem. While differences with the profitable

---

[272]LHC minutes, 29 April 1902, 30 April 1907, 25 November 1913; extensive set of documents, at LHC, relating to R. Dale Benson *et al.* vs. The Laurel Hill Cemetery, argued in Court of Common Pleas, No. 5, of Philadelphia County, June Term, 1914, at LHC.

[273]Thomas, 43-44; on endowments, see LHC minutes, 21 March 1872, 16 March, 20 July 1923.

[274]On the financial problems of "monumented cemeteries" in this era, see Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*, 203-04. Open areas included picturesque Forest Outlook in the far southwest corner of South Laurel Hill and the long-stigmatized lowlands of Central. The latter were surveyed during the 1940s and dubbed Valley View (LHC survey map collection).

West Laurel Hill had long since softened, there were limits to which the newer institution could subsidize the old. Laurel Hill, now officially designated non-profit, would have to rely on a small operating budget and greatly reduced staff.[275]

In 1836, Laurel Hill opened as a commercial enterprise. It marketed a bucolic, pre-capitalist ideal to well-heeled white urbanites of the industrial age. In the late 1990s, Laurel Hill borders a decaying, predominantly African-American neighborhood and is flanked by two high-speed roads. Thomas Delahunty's marble yard - itself once a threat to the pastoral ideal - is gone, replaced by parking lots and little-used storage buildings. The label "rural cemetery" now confuses visitors.

Without judging the nobility of John Jay Smith's cause, it is still possible to comment on the larger cultural significance of his institution. Laurel Hill started the careers of a few people who helped shape the American urban experience: along with Smith, John Notman and J. C. Sidney created places that affected the use and feel of nineteenth-century cities. Many more people found in these men's joint creation an almost mystical retreat. Some buried themselves and their relatives there. Others came to contemplate history, nature and art, or merely to enjoy the space without cerebral effort. Laurel Hill's meanings were always broader than the ones its founders intended. Those meanings have also changed greatly with time. Planned as bastion of patrician exclusivity, the institution soon became more public than anyone had foreseen. Today, Laurel Hill's best hope may again lie in tourism. Perhaps is time to welcome back Philadelphia's "living tide."

PART II: PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

A. North Laurel Hill

The first piece of land acquired by Laurel Hill's founders (1836) comprised 32 acres lying on either side of Ridge Avenue. While the 12-acre lot east of Ridge was eventually sold off, the 20 acres to the west now represent the oldest portion of the cemetery, known as North Laurel Hill. Resting on a massive outcropping of granitized schist, this tract forms a plateau some 100 feet above the Schuylkill. Its "deep, dry and well-drained" soil make it eminently suitable for burial and planting.[276] The plan of North Laurel Hill is essentially that devised by architect John Notman and laid out by surveyor Philip M. Price between 1836 and 1840. Loosely based on Henry E. Kendall's scheme for Kensal Green Cemetery near London, the design is organized around a main drive that assumes the shape of an uneven oval. The oval's orientation allows much of the drive to parallel the underlying ridge, reducing the amount of initial grading

---

[275]According to Laurel Hill General Manager Joseph J. Direso, Jr., the cemetery received non-profit status as early as 1934.

[276]HSR, 42, 44.

required. Sinuous gravel footpaths, now largely overgrown, travel inward from the drive, forming a complex geometrical pattern at their intersection. Early plans suggest that this node, identified as the "Shrubbery," was supposed to remain decorative in function and free from burial. However, the cemetery's managers paid little heed to this stipulation and had sold 45 burial lots in the section by 1839.[277] A hallmark of "gardenesque" landscape treatment, the Shrubbery constitutes the Notman plan's most formal element. Elsewhere the architect tended to avoid strict geometry, laying down a network of winding paths most fully developed near the northeast corner of the site.

Three scales of construction underlie the cemetery's circulation system. The main drive varies from 14 to 16 feet in width, major paths range from 4 to 6 feet, and secondary paths maintain a 3-foot standard. Initially paved with gravel, the drive is now asphalted in order to facilitate automobile travel. The road's early retaining walls have also been supplemented by newer ones in several places. Some paths are covered in concrete and others obscured by grass, yet their contours remain clear and their original materials are still in place.[278]

Prior to its use as a cemetery, the North Laurel Hill tract had been the country seat of Joseph Sims. Although Sims' mansion and outbuildings vanished within ten years of the cemetery's establishment, features related to the site's previous use indelibly shaped Notman's plan. The western segment of the main drive passes around an ovoid lot, known as T Circle, that once served as the estate's carriage turnaround. North of the cemetery's entrance, a straight path runs almost due east, dividing Sections A, B and N from C and O. This marks the course of a road that led from Sims' house and stables to Ridge Avenue. Ironically, the demolition of the estate helped complete the cemetery plan: at least one of the terraces that make up the "theater" in Section S consists of ashlar blocks salvaged from the rubble of the mansion.[279] Notman's 1840-41 plan shows that he envisioned more terraces for the site than were built. His influence over the cemetery's design ended around this time, and the gridded areas that form Sections O and G are not his work.

The survey and sale of lots followed an uneven pattern, moving gradually outward from the cemetery's core. Sections A - C and E - I were receiving interments by the end of 1836; L and D joined the list the following year. In 1840 Saint John's Lutheran Evangelical Church acquired the new Section O, laid out by Philip M. Price under to Smith's direction.[280] Lots in sections M, R, S and T Circle were available by 1853 and the cemetery was becoming more crowded. In the

---

[277][John Jay Smith], *Regulations* (1839 ed.), 12-20.

[278]On the specifications and evolution of the circulation system, see HSR, 54-5, 66.

[279] LHC minutes, 8 January 1845.

[280]Price to Smith, 12 October 1840, Smith Papers, Library Company of Philadelphia. Information on lot sales appears in the cemetery's sales books, at LHC.

mid 1880s, the managers opened up prime burial space by demolishing a chapel and superintendent's cottage that Notman had placed near the Sims estate's outbuildings. After grading and gridding, this area became Chapel Section. River Section, where lot sales had occurred occasionally from an early date, was bolstered by the present retaining wall in 1895.

The imposing Roman Doric gatehouse, through which all visitors now enter, is Notman's primary architectural contribution to Laurel Hill. Erected in 1836, the two-story building faces Ridge Avenue south of Clearfield Street and measures 68 feet (N-S) by 44.5 feet (E-W) in plan. A granite block foundation supports stone walls that have been stuccoed and scored to imitate ashlar. Octastyle porticoes adorn the front and rear facades and are connected via a barrel-vaulted passageway. All columns are made of stuccoed wood; those on the front are fluted while others are plain; they support a full Doric entablature that masks a low hip roof.[281]

The structure roughly resembles a Roman triumphal arch and provided Notman with a device for unifying two separate living quarters: a Gardener's Lodge and a Porter's Lodge. The passageway that divides these spaces is covered by a coffered vault resting on hexastyle colonnades. Originally, the colonnades screened the passageway from flanking, elevated walkways. One of these remains intact, but the other was glassed in during a 1910s remodeling that turned the north lodge into an office. Two-story frame additions, built in the same era, adjoin the north and south ends of the gatehouse. Designed to provide new working and living space for the superintendent, these wings partially incorporate original, colonnaded walls that visually extend the facade. Other changes appear in the configuration of certain doors and windows. The most obvious incongruities are the bay windows added to the front and rear of the north lodge during its office conversion. This switch in function also deprived the north lodge of its original interior. The south lodge, however, has been altered less drastically. Now rented as an apartment, it retains moldings and other features that could aid in the restoration of its northern counterpart.

Visitors passing through the entrance arch are immediately greeted by Notman's stuccoed, turreted enclosure housing the sculpture group *Old Mortality and His Pony*. The work consists of three sandstone figures carved in the mid 1830s by Scottish sculptor James Thom. Seated on a sarcophagus at the center of the composition is Thom's representation of Old Mortality, an itinerant peasant who re-cuts the names of the dead on their tombstones in the works of Sir Walter Scott. A statue of Scott himself gazes at the peasant, while Old Mortality's pony stands in the background. In placing this piece on prominent display, John Jay Smith and other cemetery managers intended to publicly equate Old Mortality's mission with their own: "as Old Mortality loved to repair defaced tombstones, so the originators of the plan of the Cemetery hope it may be the study of their successors to keep the place in perpetual repair, and to transmit it undefaced to a distant date." To the sculptures' right stands a decapitated plaster bust of the artist, placed there

[281] A thorough description of the gatehouse's original appearance is recorded in Franklin Fire Insurance Survey No. 1967 (20 December 1839), at HSP. For information on the structure's evolution see LHC minutes and HSR, 88-104.

by Smith during the early 1870s.[282]

Significant monuments appear in almost all sections of North Laurel Hill, and their designs tend to follow one of several themes. Like some other pioneers of the rural cemetery movement, Smith took special interest in the way burial places functioned as "historical records." He was also aware of the illustrious dead's great advertising value and, in 1838, arranged for the re-interment of Continental Congress Secretary Charles Thomson's remains at Laurel Hill. Cemetery managers then sponsored the construction of a large granite obelisk over Thomson's grave (River Section). Employed earlier at Bunker Hill and planned for the Washington Monument, the obelisk was already an established form for commemorating national heros. Upon completion, Thomson's monument was probably the biggest of its kind at Laurel Hill, but obelisks of all sizes dotted the cemetery over the next few years.

Roman forms provided another way to honor the New Republic's local heros. Commodore Isaac Hull received a sarcophagus like that of Scipio, surmounted by an eagle (ca. 1843). The work of William Strickland and John Struthers, this stands in Section G, lot 241. Other monuments employing Roman motifs are those of General Hugh Mercer and William Young Birch, both designed by J. M. Hamilton (1840, Sec. G, #121; ca. 1837, Sec. I, #139-44). Before 1860, architects Strickland, Notman, Hamilton and Thomas U. Walter along with masons John and William Struthers, Edwin Greble and Thomas Hargrave received many important funerary commissions at Laurel Hill.[283]

The cemetery's most interesting and elaborate monuments are often biographical in design. Some highlight an individual's profession, achievements or death pictorially. The sarcophagus of industrialist Thomas Sparks shows his shot tower in low relief, while the tomb of Joseph Lewis depicts the Philadelphia Waterworks he helped establish (ca. 1855, Sec. G, #219; Notman and J. Struthers, 1838, Sec. H, #6-9, 18). Following her death in Egypt, Mary Cooke was interred beneath a sarcophagus like Hull's, adorned with an illustration of the pyramids at Giza (Messrs. Struthers, ca. 1842, Sec. G, #140, 142).

Other monuments relate personal history in a less literal manner, employing allegory and metaphor. Naval and military motifs appear frequently on the tombs of those who served in the armed forces. The monument commemorating Major Levi Twiggs and his son, Lieutenant John Twiggs is an unusually sculptural variation on this theme (Richard Graff, 1847, Sec. C, #20). Both men were casualties of the Mexican War. They are buried beneath a brownstone

---

[282][John Jay Smith], *Old Mortality*, 4. See also idem, *Recollections*, 256.

[283]LHC *Guides* of 1844 and 1854 supply the names of many monuments' designers and builders. These names sometimes appear on the monuments themselves but can be hard to decipher. For further attributions, see Constance M. Greiff, 56-60, and Thomas, 36-44.

monument that incorporates an anchor, fasces, and a rock pile (or cairn).[284] The granite mass marking Robert Stewart's grave is equally anecdotal (ca. 1858, Sec. G, #171). Resembling an urn shattered on a sharp rock, the design refers to Stewart's violent death, supposedly at the hands of his servant. Broken columns, a more generic symbol of "life cut short," appear throughout the grounds.

Laurel Hill and other rural cemeteries achieved success, in part, through guaranteeing that family members could be buried together. Material expressions of family unity were an important part of Victorian culture, and burial lots provided the ideal venue. An especially good example of the phenomenon is the Fotterall family lot, where two varieties of small, Gothic Revival markers cluster around a large monument of the same style (ca. 1840-60, Sec. F, #41-42, 44, 57-59) (Fig. 10). No other family lot achieved this degree of order in its layout, but many once conveyed the idea of unity through copings and iron perimeter fences. The latter have usually disappeared, falling victim to salvage drives or the need to facilitate mowing. Those that survive surround the Bohlen, Lentz, Paul, and Wharton lots, among others (Sec. F, 61-64; Sec. I, #182; Sec. I, #162; Sec. G, #157).

Finally, numerous monuments and mausoleums vividly reflect the architectural styles of their day. Borrowing the form he applied to banks and churches, William Strickland designed a diminutive Greek temple for Alfred Miller (w/ Messrs. Struthers, 1840, Sec. A, #68-69, 76-77). Notman employed the same style for the Robinson mausoleum, and demonstrated his proficiency in the Gothic mode with the sarcophagus of John and Margaret Evans (ca. 1838, Sec. P, #1; 1849, Sec. A, #1-4). Impressive displays of the Egytian Revival include the Dolan, Lenning and Ball mausoleums, the latter conceived by Thomas U. Walter (Sec. G, #116.5; Sec. P, #5; ca. 1841, Sec. G, #110-112). Moorish designs, sometimes favored by non-Christians, are less well represented in North Laurel Hill than in some other parts of the cemetery. An exception to the rule is the Voorhees mausoleum (ca. 1863, Sec. S, #71). North Laurel Hill's finest high-style works of the 20th century are the Beaux-Arts Henry Charles Lea monument and the Art-Nouveau Walling mausoleum (sculptor Alexander Stirling Calder w/ architects Zantziger and Borie, ca. 1909, Sec. S, #36, 49; monument dealer John Gessler's Sons, 1918, Sec. S, #102).

B. South Laurel Hill

After a decade of operation, Laurel Hill was a proven success. Lots were selling quickly, and the cemetery's founders perceived the need to secure additional burial space before the original tract was exhausted. They were apparently unable to acquire adjacent land and turned instead to Harleigh, the former estate of jurist William Rawle. This property was located .2 miles south of the cemetery, between Nicetown Lane (now Hunting Park Avenue) and the extended line of Huntingdon Avenue. The 27-acre swath descended roughly 120 feet from southeast to northwest, forming steep terrain conducive to the display of monuments. Since 1849, this site

[284]Scharf and Westcott 3: 1875.

has served as Laurel Hill's southern extension.

The layout of South Laurel Hill is softer and simpler than North Laurel Hill, its broadly curving lines lacking the formal focus of Notman's design. Civil engineer James C. Sidney may initially have conceived the plan as a series of concentric crescents attached to a grid - a clear, if somewhat crude, acknowledgment of the site's topography. Sidney refined the scheme between 1849 and 1854, collaborating with architect James P. W. Neff throughout most of the period. In final form, their design consists of curving and rectilinear grids joined by an upper and a lower drive. The architect and engineer essentially maintained Notman's scales of circulation. Perhaps they intended the lower drive to traverse the tract's western half, but the road remains a large loop with no southern extension.[285]

Early lot sales were concentrated on the property's southeastern half, claiming ground in Sections 1-4 and 7 by 1850. Soon, an area along the cemetery's eastern border grew into unofficial church quarter. Although the notion of non-sectarian burial had once met with resistance from religious leaders, the Society of Friends showed this era was past by acquiring Section 4. In accordance with Quaker practice, burial here was to involve little ceremony and no markers. Laurel Hill's managers lifted these restrictions in 1887, but the section's spartan appearance still bespeaks its past. Fifth Baptist Church bought up most of Section 6 starting in 1852 and the First Dutch Reformed Church took on Section 13 two years later. Meanwhile, Sections 5 and 8-11 came into use, followed by 14-18 between 1854 and 1861. At the outset, Section 1 had been "appropriated for family vaults." Wanting control over even more space, the Coates family formed a burial association and purchased large lots in Section 9. For those at the other end of the economic scale, Section 15 was reserved for "single interments."[286]

South Laurel Hill's size and discontinuity with the North Laurel Hill led Sidney and Neff to include living accommodations for a second superintendent at the center of their scheme (Sections 1 and 10). Parts of this complex and the surrounding road system may have been vestiges of the Harleigh estate. However, the area was cleared for burial use during the 1870s and retains few above-ground clues to its earlier appearance; pre-1861 plans supply most of the evidence. These plans also show three entrances to the cemetery grounds. One, facing Hunting Park Avenue near Ridge, is still marked on the landscape by a small iron gate. This has gone unused since 1947, when the City depressed the avenue. Another opening, on Ridge Avenue, terminated a drive leading to the superintendent's house, and was blocked by about 1870. The third, and main, entrance survives further south on Ridge, its location announced by architect

---

[285]Company minutes, Sidney and Neff's 1854 plan, and the images reproduced here are the basis of this description.

[286]LHC minutes; sales books; 1854 Sidney and Neff plan; R. A. Smith, *Illustrated Guide*, 119-121. In the nineteenth century, single graves were the option of the friendless or destitute, collectively categorized as "strangers" by cemetery management.

John McArthur, Jr.'s substantial gateposts.[287]

McArthur's 1849 design uses four sandstone hanging posts to support vehicular and pedestrian gates. All posts are capped by cornice blocks, and the larger, inner piers are also adorned with urns. Ironmaster Robert Wood supplied the gates that swung from these solid moorings. Today, the inner gates remain, but the flanking pedestrian gates have been replaced with iron fences. A small, porticoed gatehouse, located south of the entrance in early views, has also disappeared.

The one building presently standing in South Laurel Hill is a receiving tomb built by Conkling Armstrong Terra Cotta Company in 1913. Lying west of the road to Central Laurel Hill, this concrete and terra cotta structure takes the form of a hexastyle Doric temple with a hip roof. Its windowless walls surround a series of ventilated crypts designed for temporary storage of bodies. A central entry provides access to these crypts, and is flanked by gates to four separate rental mausoleums.[288]

Because of its later date, South Laurel Hill lacks some of the monument types found in North. Republican iconography is less apparent, and biographical bas-relief is absent. Yet several designers who had received monument commissions during the cemetery's opening years returned after 1849 to decorate Sidney and Neff's landscape. Sarah A. Harrison's tomb is the work of John Notman himself (w/ sculptor J. Maples, ca. 1850, Sec. 7, #11-16). It features a small Gothic arcade surrounding a sculpture of a sleeping lamb. Such symbols of innocence, piety, and premature death were staples of 19th century funerary design. The same themes converge in Henry D. Saunders' marble sculpture of "a woman clasping two babes in her arms" (1858, Sec. 7, #375). This monument assumed special meaning for Victorian visitors, who knew that it marked the grave of Saunders' drowned wife and children.[289]

The tomb of William J. Mullen achieved even greater renown in its day (ca. 1876-82, Sec. 15, #39). A businessman turned philanthropist, Mullen was determined that future generations should remember his efforts on behalf of prisoners and the poor. Following Mullen's instructions, local sculptor E. Kornbau created an architectural setting based on Philadelphia's Moyamensing prison. Around this device, the artist arrayed statues of his patron, a freed prisoner and an angel that, along with other symbols, creates an allegory of Mullen's beneficence

---

[287]As recorded in an account book labeled "Disbursements, Laurel Hill Cemetery South," McArthur served as architect and builder of the gates. He appears to have based the design on plate 5 of John Jay Smith's and Thomas U. Walter's *Two Hundred Designs*.

[288]This information appears in LHC minutes, a ca. 1913 brochure entitled "Mausoleums for Rent," and four undated drawings from Conkling Armstrong at LHC.

[289]Thomas, 38; Scharf and Westcott, 3: 1881; *Laurel Hill Cemetery: Treasureland of Historic Interest* (1929 pamphlet), 27.

and anticipated salvation.[290] A later and humbler use of Christian iconography is the rustic monument of Reverend Walter Munford (ca. 1910, Sec. 16, #68). Here a pair of stone tree trunks merge to support an open bible.

Architecturally distinguished mausoleums abound in South Laurel Hill. Section 10's steep western exposure and similar parts of Section 9 were venues for dense construction during the mid 19th century. The result is a series of mausoleum rows like those in Sections G, P, and S in the older part of the cemetery. H. N. Burrough's brownstone tomb is an able essay in Gothic Revivalism, the Baugh and Bennet mausoleums adopt Egyptian forms, and the Stockley mausoleum provides a show of Victorian eclecticism (Sec. 10, #41; Sec. 9, #145; Sec. 10, #87.5; Sec. 10, #132). The Classical structure housing the remains of G. W. South's is unique in its cast iron construction but badly in need of repair (Sec. 10, #46).

C. Stoever Tract

A few years after South Laurel Hill's founding, the State Assembly authorized the cemetery company to expand its holdings between the lines of Huntingdon and Allegheny Avenues. The act seems to have conferred some retroactive legitimacy on the Harleigh purchase. It also laid way for the next addition to Laurel Hill: the Stoever tract. In 1855, cemetery managers secured just over 10 acres of land from Frederick Stoever, extending the original 1836 purchase north to the tracks of the Reading Railroad. The new site's topography differed little from that of North Laurel Hill, but descended less dramatically to the Schuylkill.

Unlike South Laurel Hill, Stoever's land was too small to require a new plan or superintendent. Cemetery managers treated the property as an adjunct to North, elongating the drive that borders Section G and terminating it in a cul-de-sac. The rest of the site was gridded into lots. Those in sections flanking the drive (W and X) started selling in the first year, but Section Y was not ready until 1860. Section Z opened for burial seven years later. Around the turn of the century, the path running due north from the cul-de-sac led to a railroad station. In other respects, the railroad's presence does not seem to have factored in the design of the cemetery.[291]

Monuments in the 1855 addition tend to be more modest than those in other parts of Laurel Hill. This is due, in part, to the tract's fairly even terrain, which provided few opportunities for picturesque display. As in South, the works of the earliest generation of architects and sculptors are scarce. John Notman's monument for Captain Steven Lavalett stands in Stoever because it was moved there (ca. 1845, Sec W, #122, 124). The design features a marble block adorned with naval motifs and surmounted by and urn. Employing marble bas-relief, the Yellow Fever

---

[290]Thomas, 43.

[291]Two plans of the railroad's property, at LHC, are the main evidence for the station's existence. One plan is dated 1910.

Monument also recalls an older commemorative style (1859, Sec. W, #200). A Doric column rests on a paneled block with images and text honoring "Doctors, Druggist and Nurses" who died fighting an epidemic in Virginia.[292]

The most notable statue in Stoever is the seated bronze figure of William E. Cresson, who helped found the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts (1869, Sec. W. #284). Sculptor Joseph A. Bailly captured Cresson's features with great accuracy, prompting a 20th-century authority to label the work "extremely advanced" for its day.[293] An exception to the previously mentioned rule of modesty is the large Eastlake monument that presides over the Rotan family lot (Sec. W, #259). Other forays into grand, high-style design include the Egyptian Revival Gratz mausoleum (ca. 1873?, Sec. W, #262, 309, 310) and the Renaissance Revival mausoleum of publishing magnate Louis Godey (ca. 1878, WXYZ Oval, #3).

D. Central Laurel Hill

After Frederick Stoever's land came within the bounds of Laurel Hill, one major gap remained in the cemetery company's holdings. Between North and South Laurel Hill lay Fairy Hill, the 21-acre estate of George Pepper. Pepper's death gave cemetery managers a chance to gain control of the property, and in 1861 the crucial "connecting link" became Central Laurel Hill.
John Jay Smith expressed some initial anxiety about the rugged state of the site. In an address to his fellow managers he observed, "This new plot is mostly overwooded and will require judgement and attention to bring it to public success. It is believed that this can be done economically by the aid of not more than two additional regular hands, the usual enclosures, surveys, walks and some little judicious planting in the meadows, etc." Whether or not a landscape architect was ever hired to prepare the property for its new use remains unclear. However, Smith's repeated emphasis on the need to economize while laying out the grounds suggests that Griffith M. Hopkins may have played a design role in his capacity as Central Laurel Hill's surveyor.[294]

Whatever its expense, Central Laurel Hill dates from an era in which cemetery designers were gradually retreating from the picturesque. More than Notman's or Sidney's work, the 1860s scheme is axial. The site's north-south ridge supplies this axis and is clearly marked by three equidistant paths punctuated by *rond-points*. Other paths cross the ridge at right angles, forming a grid that is encircled by the upper drive's meandering loop. To the east, two lower drives that were intended to form an X have long functioned as a V. On one hand, the length of road between Sections Q and Valley View has never been fully developed. On the other hand, the

---

[292]Greiff, 60; Scharf and Westcott, 3: 1878.

[293]Thomas, 43.

[294]LHC minutes, 15 January 1861, 21 April 1864; Laurel Hill "Day Book," 1864-65.

road north of Valley View has changed uses. Once part of a secondary connection between North and South Laurel Hill, it has served as a path at least since the depression of Hunting Park Avenue (1947). At the southern end of this road-turned-path stood a pedestrian gate (demolished) that corresponded with one already mentioned in South Laurel Hill. Further west along the avenue is an iron vehicular gate on stone posts. It was built by contractor William McCloy in 1898 according to a simple, vaguely Classical design, and has changed little.[295]

The ease with which cars now navigate Laurel Hill belies the difficulty once entailed in unifying the cemetery's circulation system. In North Laurel Hill, a path bordering Section M was widened into the present road. The eastern segment of Central's main loop continued this route, but the valley through which Nicetown Lane (Hunting Park Avenue) traveled was a formidable obstacle to further passage. Here the managers decided to build a bridge, awarding the contract to the Dolan and Shields construction firm. Work began in 1864 and continued the following year. At long last, the stone bridge linking Central and South Laurel reached completion. Its three spans were reduced to two by 1903, and a nearby superintendent's cottage vanished even earlier. As in other parts of the cemetery, Central's gravel roads have generally been paved.[296]

The terms under which cemetery managers had obtained the Stoever tract delayed lot sales in Central until 1865. In that year, Sections J, K, Q and T yielded ground for interment. More surveying allowed sales to proceed in U, V and Bridge Sections by 1885. Valley View is a much later creation, begun around World War II. The area it occupies has long been associated with the cemetery's service functions and these have obstructed or discouraged burial. The present garage and sheds stand where several generations of greenhouses once stood.

In few places is the material splendor of the Gilded Age better represented than at Central Laurel Hill. By the time George Pepper's estate was ready for funerary use, many of the best lots in other parts of the cemetery had been claimed. Wealthy Philadelphians of the post-Civil-War era took the new opportunity to be buried together. In some cases they chose monuments that combined or exaggerated earlier types. The Knight monument, for instance, consists of three broken shafts instead of one (Sec. K, #61). Going several steps further, the massive, angel-capped columns of Clothier and Kirkpatrick dominate their surroundings with the help of high bases (Sec. T, #233-36; Sec. T, #304-07). Giant obelisks abound as well, their construction spurred by renewed national attention to the Washington Monument during the 1870s.

Joseph A. Bailly's seated statue of W. F. Hughes is, perhaps, the only literal representation of a deceased person in Central (Sec. K, #47, 49). In other cases, Bailly honors General Francis E. Patterson with a female nude clasping a funerary urn, and J. Lacmer's lion sits atop the grave of General Robert Patterson (Sec. K, #38, 51). Surrounded by the usual commemorative trappings

---

[295]Laurel Hill Day Book, 22 June 1898.

[296]Laurel Hill Day Book, 1864-67; LHC minutes, 20 September 1898.

of military service, the lion was obviously chosen for its associations with strength and courage. The human soul is a harder concept to depict sculpturally. An able and creative attempt is Alexander M. Calder's design for William Warner's monument: a winged head escaping from a sarcophagus (ca. 1889, Sec. J, #74, 76). Bringing funerary allegory into the 20th century, Harriet Frishmuth's Berwind monument features a female figure reaching heavenward to signify "Aspiration" (1933, Sec. U, #562).[297]

As suggested above, members of certain social groups have tended to cluster into distinct "neighborhoods" in both life and death. Laurel Hill's managers maintained some control over this pattern by regulating the size, price and location of lots. Together, lot holders and managers gradually assembled Millionaire's Row, a *nouveau riche* district in the southeastern portion of Section K. This contains the temple-fronted Kemble, Widener and Childs mausoleums, built at the turn of the century (Sec. K, #330; Sec. K, #337; Sec. K, #338). Not far away, the body of tool manufacturer Henry Disston rests in a French Renaissance mausoleum, while the Benson and Jex mausoleums assume Moorish and Eastlake forms (ca. 1879, Bridge Sec, #1-4; ca. 1870, Sec. K, #324; ca. 1885, Sec. K, #317). As late as 1903, the Blabon mausoleum serves as a study in the Egyptian Revival (Bridge Sec., #31). Art Nouveau design characterizes the later mausoleum of Lillie Keim (Sec. V, #16).

E. Walls and Plantings

Boundary changes and structural problems led to the periodic rebuilding of Laurel Hill's walls throughout the 19th century. The present walls generally consist of granite block and date from ca. 1875-1900.[298] Walls along both sides of Hunting Park Avenue are surmounted by considerable lengths of cast-iron fencing, presumably of the same vintage. Smaller sections of this fencing appear on other walls as well. Most of the cemetery's walls serve a retaining function. Some additional retaining construction has been mentioned above.

As documented in a 1979 historic structure report, "Few, if any, of the original trees and shrubs are left at Laurel Hill." The present plantings include many deciduous species while the original scheme relied heavily on conifers and other evergreens. John Jay Smith's interest in horticulture lead him to include a complete plant list in the 1844 *Guide* to the cemetery, and a surviving plan from the same period indicates tree locations. These documents could provide the basis for a fairly accurate restoration of North Laurel Hill at some future date.[299]

---

[297]Thomas, 39-44.

[298]Much wall planning commenced after 1869, when the managers reluctantly sold the Fairmount Park Commission four acres along the cemetery's eastern edge. This sale allowed the Commission to extend East River Drive (now Kelly Drive).

[299]HSR, 54-59, 69, 72-77.

PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A. Architectural and Engineering Drawings:

Conkling Armstrong Terra Cotta Company. Four detail drawings of Laurel Hill Cemetery Receiving Tomb, n.d. [ca. 1912]. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Constable, Casimir. Set of plats and related manuscripts showing land sold by Laurel Hill Cemetery Company to Fairmount Park Commission, [1869]. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company, and City Archives, Philadelphia.

Keisker, Frank H. Plan of the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad's Laurel Hill Station, n.d. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

McCloy, William. Plan and estimate for vehicular gate, Central Laurel Hill Cemetery, 1898. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Neff, James P. W., and James C. Sidney. Plan of South Laurel Hill Cemetery, 1854. Revised versions, [ca. 1869] and 1892. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Notman, John. Laurel Hill Cemetery chapel, south elevation, n.d. Philadelphia Athenaeum.

[Smith, John Jay?]. Unexecuted sketch plan for Central Laurel Hill Cemetery, n.d., Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Strickland, William. Competition drawings for Laurel Hill Cemetery entrance and plan, [May 1836?]. Library Company of Philadelphia.

Walter, Thomas Ustick. Competition drawing for Laurel Hill Cemetery entrance, 14 May 1836. Library Company of Philadelphia.

[_____, attributed, probably incorrectly]. Competition drawing for Laurel Hill Cemetery plan, [May 1836?]. Library Company of Philadelphia.

B. Early Illustrations:

Birch, William. "Mendenghall [sic] Ferry." Engraving, plate 15 in William Birch, *The Country Seats of the United States of North America.* Springfield, [PA]: n.p., 1808.

Brightly, [?]. "Entrance to Laurel Hill Cemetery." Engraving in R. A. Smith, *Smith's*

Illustrated Guide to and through Laurel Hill Cemetery. Philadelphia: Willis P. Hazard, 1852.

Graham, A.W. "Laurel Hill." Engraving, after drawing by W. Croome, in *Godey's Lady's Book* 28, no. 10 (March 1844). Reprinted in [John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill Cemetery, Near Philadelphia.* Philadelphia: C. Sherman, 1844.

"Ground Plan of Laurel Hill Cemetery" and "Front View of Part of the Entrance." Woodcut [?] in [John Jay Smith], *Statues of Old Mortality and His Pony, and of Sir Walter Scott.* Philadelphia: A. Waldie, [1838].

Hammond, I. P. "Plan of the Laurel Hill Cemetery near Philadelphia." Engraving based on surveys of Philip M. Price. First state, [ca. 1836], at Library Company of Philadelphia; second state, [ca. 1837], at Philadelphia Athenaeum; third state, [ca. 1845], at Laurel Hill Cemetery Company; copper plates showing third state, at same.

Koellner, Augustus. "Laurel Hill Cemetery." Drawing. Location unknown. Photograph in collection of Laurel Hill Cemetery Company; lithograph by Deroy in *Views of American Cities.* New York: Goupil, Vibert & Co., 1848-51.

Laurel Hill Cemetery, frontal view. Unidentified painting, ca. 1840. Photograph in uncatalogued collection of Nicholas Wainwright, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

"Old Mortality." Engraving in *Godey's Lady's Book* 24, no. 16 (April 1842), frontispiece.

Pinkerton, E. J. "General View of Laurel Hill Cemetery." Lithograph, after drawing by John Notman, in [John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill Cemetery, Near Philadelphia.* Philadelphia: C. Sherman, 1844. Reprinted in 1849

Pinkerton, E. J. "Ground Plan of Laurel Hill Cemetery." Lithograph, after drawing by John Notman, in [John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill Cemetery, Near Philadelphia.* Philadelphia: C. Sherman, 1844.

Pinkerton, Wagner & McGuigan. "Chapel [at Laurel Hill]." Lithograph, after drawing by John Notman, in [John Jay Smith], *Guide to Laurel Hill Cemetery, Near Philadelphia.* Philadelphia: C. Sherman, 1844.

Shindler, Antonio Zeno. "Laurel Hill Cemetery, Philadelphia." Painting. 1850s. M. and M. Karolik Collection, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Wild, J. C. "Laurel Hill Cemetery, Philadelphia." Lithograph in J. C. Wild and J. R. Chevalier, *Views of Philadelphia and its Vicinity.* Philadelphia, n.p., 1838. Reprinted by J. T. Bowen, 1838, 1848.

C. Early Views:

The Laurel Hill Cemetery Company maintains a large collection of nineteenth- and twentieth-century photographs showing landscape, buildings, and individual monuments.

D. Maps:

Ellet, Charles, Jr. *A Map of the County of Philadelphia from Actual Survey Made Under the Direction of Charles Ellet, Jr., Civil Engineer.* 1843 (surveyed 1839).

Hills, John. *Plan of the City of Philadelphia and Environs.* 1809.

Hopkins, Griffith M. *City Atlas of Philadelphia.* Philadelphia: G. M. Hopkins & Co., 1875.

Otley, J. W., and James C. Sidney. *Map of the City of Philadelphia Together with the Surrounding Districts, Compiled from J. C. Sidney's Map Reduced and Improved by J. W. Otley, Surveyor.* Philadelphia: A. McElroy, 1850.

Sidney, James C. *Sidney's Map of Ten Miles Round; Map of the Circuit of Ten Miles Around The City of Philadelphia.* Philadelphia: Robert P. Smith, 1847.

_____. *Map of the City of Philadelphia Together With All the Surrounding Districts, Including Camden, N. J.* Philadelphia: Smith and Wistar, 1849.

Smedley, Samuel L. *Smedley's Atlas of the City of Philadelphia.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1862.

E. Bibliography:

Primary Sources, Unpublished

Accounting Records and Minutes

Cash or Disbursement Books of Laurel Hill Cemetery Company [accounts kept separately for each section of the cemetery], AMs, 1836-60. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Day Books of Laurel Hill Cemetery Company [i.e., general cash books], AMs, 1864-1900. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Minutes of the Managers of Laurel Hill Cemetery Company, AMs and TD, 1835-1924. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Sales Books of Laurel Hill Cemetery Company [i.e., lot sale books], AMs, 1836-1900. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

"Statement of cost of Real Estate and improvements at Laurel Hill Cemetery from Feb. 26, 1836 to Feb 26, 1837 with interest and Commission at the rate of ten p. cent p. annum," AMs. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Brochures and Pamphlets

Aeroplane Panorama, Laurel Hill Cemetery. 1927.

[Brown, Frederick, Richard Harlan and Charles D. Meigs]. *Proposals for Erecting a Monument, by Subscription, in the Laurel Hill Cemetery, Commemorative of Native Genius and Worth, as Exemplified in the Life and Writings of the Late David Rittenhouse, Thomas Godfrey, Alexander Wilson, and Thomas Say, Citizens of Philadelphia.* Philadelphia: n.p., 1836.

Laurel Hill Cemetery: Treasureland of Historic Interest. 1929.

Mausoleums for Rent [in Laurel Hill Cemetery's receiving tomb]. 1916.

Philadelphia Cemetery; Copy of the Deeds of Trust, Charter, By-Laws and List of Lot-Holders; with an Account of the Cemetery. Philadelphia: Mifflin and Parry, 1845.

Preamble to and Constitution of the Mutual Family Burying Ground Association, of the City and County of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: n. p., 1827.

Special Care of Lots, Endowments, Bequests [at Laurel Hill Cemetery]. 1917.

Deeds and Leases:

Campbell, George, to Nathan Dunn, Frederick Brown, Benjamin W. Richards, and John Jay Smith, Jr. Deed for "Laurel Hill," in trust, Philadelphia County Deed Book G.S. 1, p. 463 (30 May 1839). Transcribed in "Abstract of the Title to Laurel Hill," (see Letters and Misc. Manuscripts).

Dunn, Nathan, and John Sherwood. Memorandum of agreement describing terms under which Sherwood has rented land "on the East side of the Ridge Turnpike Road," 3 September 1836, AMsS. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Dunn, Nathan, to George Campbell. Deed for "Laurel Hill," in trust, Philadelphia County Deed Book G.S. 1, p. 460 (30 May 1839). Transcribed in "Abstract of the Title to Laurel Hill," (see Letters and Misc. Manuscripts).

Guth, Francis, and Michel Guth, to Nathan Dunn. Deed for "Laurel Hill," Philadelphia County Deed Book A.M. 73, p. 194 (26 February 1836). Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

James, John F., and wife Henrietta Louisa, to Frederick Brown, Benjamin W. Richards and John Jay Smith. Deed for "Harleigh," in trust, Philadelphia County Deed Book G. W. C. 21, p. 337 (10 May 1849); restated in Philadelphia County Deed Book G. W. C. 112, p. 341 (29 May 1851). Transcribed in "Abstract of the Title to Laurel Hill," (see Letters and Misc. Manuscripts).

Livezey, John, and wife Sarah, to John F. James. Deed for "Harleigh," Philadelphia County Deed Book A. W. M. 71, p. 330 (15 June 1848). Transcribed in "Abstract of the Title to Laurel Hill," (see Letters and Misc. Manuscripts).

Melizet, John M., to John S. Brown. Lease for "Tavern and Farm called Laurel Hill," 28 February 1832, AMsS. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Melizet, John M., to Charles Julius Hadermann. Lease for "farm called Laurel Hill," 21 September 1833, AMsS. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Penrose, Jonathan, Esq. [sheriff] to Joseph Sims. Deed for estate of Robert Milnor, Philadelphia County Deed Book 69, p. 28 (23 November 1797). Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Pepper, George S., to Frederick Brown, Benjamin W. Richards and John Jay Smith. Deed for ["Fairy Hill"], Philadelphia County Deed Book A. C. H. 24, p. 181 (29 June 1861). Transcribed in "Abstract of the Title to Laurel Hill," (see Letters and Misc. Manuscripts).

Stoever, Frederick K. to Frederick Brown and John Jay Smith. Deed for land "at the junction of the Philadelphia and Reading Rail Road and the Ridge or Wissahickon Road," Philadelphia County Deed Book R. D. W. 9, p. 205 (20 February 1855). Transcribed in "Abstract of the Title to Laurel Hill," (see Letters and Misc. Manuscripts).

Insurance Policies:

Laurel Hill Cemetery:
- Franklin Fire Insurance no. 1967 (20 December 1839), for "buildings belonging to Laurel Hill Cemetery." Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. Contains detailed descriptions and plans.
- Franklin Fire Insurance no. 63865 (27 April 1885), for "stone green house near Ridge Avenue at central Laurel Hill." Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Sims, Joseph, estate near the Falls of Schuylkill:
- Mutual Assurance no. 1673 (November, 1803), for "warehouses." Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Mutual Assurance no. 1674 (November, 1803), for "two story farm house." Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Mutual Assurance no. 1675 (November 1803), for "new two story stone barn." Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Mutual Assurance no. 1689 (November 1803), for "[mansion] house." Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Mutual Assurance no. 1708 (November 1803), for "stable and leanto." Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Willing, Thomas M., estate near the Falls of Schuylkill:
- Mutual Assurance no. 1393 (January 1803), for "two story stable." Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Mutual Assurance no. 1394 (January 1803), for "two story house." Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Letters and Miscellaneous Manuscripts

"Abstract of Title to 'Fairy Hill' or 'Central Laurel Hill,'" AMs, [1861?]. City Archives, Philadelphia.

"Abstract of the Title to Laurel Hill," AMs, bound, n.d. [post 1862]. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Brown, Frederick, [Jr.], Philadelphia, to The Trustees of Laurel Hill Cemetery, ALS, 29 February 1876. Collection of Laurel Hill Cemetery Company. Transcript in Company minutes of same date.

_____, Philadelphia, to [Lloyd P. Smith, Philadelphia], ALS, 18 May 1878. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Chadwick, A. C., East Falls, Pennsylvania, to Stuart Hunt, Laurel Hill Cemetery, ALS, 17 June 1931. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Constable, Casimir, C. E., Phoenixville, Pennsylvania, to President and Corporation of Laurel Hill Cemetery, ALS, 2 June 1869. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Mitchelle, John C. "Brief of Title To a Messuage or tenement and Tract of land called 'Harleigh,'" AMsS, June 1848. City Archives, Philadelphia.

Notman, John. "Report accompanying the Plan of Holly-wood Cemetery, Richmond Va.," In Minutes of the Hollywood Cemetery Company, AMs, 12 February 1848. Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.

Price, Philip M., Spring Garden [Philadelphia], to John Jay Smith, ALS, 12 October 1840. John Jay Smith Papers, Library Company of Philadelphia.

_____. "Report to the Managers of the Woodlands Cemetery Company." In Minutes of the Woodlands Cemetery Company of Philadelphia, AMs, 18 February 1843. Woodlands Cemetery Company, Philadelphia.

Smith, John Jay. "Memoranda Respecting the Foundation of Laurel Hill Cemetery," AMs, 1836-38. Lost ca. 1979. Unless otherwise stated, citations are to the personal notes of David Schuyler, Professor of American Studies, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, who examined the manuscript in the late 1970s.

_____, Library [Company of Philadelphia] to "Respected Friend," ALS, n.d. [ca. 1850]. Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

_____, Germantown [Philadelphia], to Caleb S. Wright, Philadelphia, ALS, 21 July 1859. Draft at Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

_____, [Germantown, Philadelphia] to James H. Castle and Charles S. Keyser, six ALS, two dated January 1857 [others from same period]. James H. Castle Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Smith, Lloyd P., Philadelphia, to [Frederick] Brown, [Jr., Philadelphia], ALS, 18 May 1878. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Vaux, George . "Brief of Title to 'Fancy Hill,' purchased by Dr. P[hilip] S[yng] Physick of Thomas M. Willing," AMsS, 28 August 1810. City Archives, Philadelphia.

Watts, William Carleton. "Some Notes on the Early Family History of the Peppers of Philadelphia," TMs, July 1948. Excerpt at Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Wright, Caleb S., Philadelphia, to John Jay Smith, [Germantown, Philadelphia], ALS, 21 July 1859. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Primary Sources, Published

Articles

[Barry, Patrick]. "Rural Cemeteries." *Horticulturist*, n.s., 3 (July 1853): 297-300.

Downing, Andrew Jackson. "Additional Notes on the Progress of Gardening in the United States." *Gardener's Magazine* 17 (March 1841), 146-47.

[_____]. "A Talk About Public Parks and Gardens." *Horticulturist, and Journal of Rural Art and Rural Taste* 3, no. 4 (October 1848): 153-58.

[_____]. "Public Cemeteries and Public Gardens." *Horticulturist, and Journal of Rural Art and Rural Taste* 4, no. 1 (July 1849): 9-12.

[Gridley, A. D.] "Rural Cemeteries." *The Horticulturist* 5 (1855): 278-282.

_____. "Cemeteries." *New Englander* 85 (October 1863): 597-619.

"J. C. Sidney [obituary]." *Gardener's Monthly and Horticulturist* 23, no. 270 (June 1881): 193.

"John Jay Smith [obituary]." *Gardener's Monthly and Horticulturist* 23, no. 276 (December 1881): 378-80.

["Laurel Hill."] *United States Gazette*, 12 March 1836.

["Laurel Hill."] *United States Gazette*, 12 December 1836.

["Laurel Hill."] *Poulson's Daily Advertiser*, 30 June and 1 July 1836.

"Laurel Hill." *National Gazette*, 21 July 1838.

"Laurel Hill." *Godey's Lady's Book* 28, no. 10 (March 1844): 107-08.

"Old Mortality," *Godey's Lady's Book* 24, no. 16 (April 1842): 233-35.

"A Rural Cemetery for Philadelphia." Reprinted from the "Saturday Chronicle" in *Waldie's Port Folio, and Companion to the Select Circulating Library*, pt. 1, no. 12 (4 June 1836): 191

Smith, John Jay. "The Editor to the Reader." *Horticulturist*, n.s., 3 (July 1855): 298-99.

_____. "Downing's Familiar Notes and Letters." *Horticulturist*, n.s., 6 (January 1856): 22-24; (February 1856): 73-76; (April 1856): 160-62.

_____. "Editor's Table." *Horticulturist*, n.s., 6 (August 1856): 386; 7 (February 1857): 100; 7 (June 1857): 280; 8 (July 1858): 329.

_____. "Parks versus Villages." *Horticulturist*, n.s., 6 (April 1856): 153-55.

_____. "Rural Cemeteries." *Horticulturist*, n.s., 6 (August 1856): 345-47; (September 1856): 393-96; (October 1856): 441-44.

_____. "Reciprocity: the City Visiting the Country." *Horticulturist*, n.s., 8 (August 1858): 345-48.

"Thoughts Connected with Rural Cemeteries." *Christian Review*, 13 (1848), 2.

"Underpass to Eliminate Traffic Bottleneck." *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 2 March 1947.

[Woolsey, Theodore D.] "Cemeteries and Monuments." *New Englander* 28 (November 1849): 489-501.

Books

Atticus. *Hints on the Subject of Interments Within the City of Philadelphia: Addressed to the Serious Consideration of the Members of Councils, Commissioners of the Districts, and Citizens Generally*. Philadelphia: William Brown, 1838.

Bigelow, Jacob. *A History of the Cemetery of Mount Auburn.* Boston and Cambridge: James Munroe, 1860.

Birch, William. *The Country Seats of the United States of North America.* Springfield, Pa.: Birch, 1808.

Chadwick, Edwin. *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain. A Supplementary Report on the Results of a Special Inquiry into the Practice of Interment in Towns.* London: W. Clowes and Sons, 1843.

Reprinted as Sanitary Report on Interments in Towns. Philadelphia: C. Sherman, 1845.

Cleveland, Nehemiah. *Green-Wood Illustrated.* New York, 1847.

_____. *Green-Wood: A History of the Institution from 1838 to 1864.* New York, 1866.

Coates, Elmer Ruan. *Laurel Hill: A Poem.* Philadelphia: Sherman & Co., 1878.

Downing, Andrew Jackson. *A Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening.* New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1841.

_____. *Rural Essays.* New York, G. P. Putnam, 1853; repr., New York: Da Capo Press, 1974.

Elkinton, John A. *The Monument Cemetery of Philadelphia (Late De L'Amerique Pere La Chaise).* Philadelphia: Rackliff & King, 1837.

Fisher, Sidney George. *A Philadelphia Perspective: The Diary of Sidney George Fisher Covering the Years 1834-1871.* Edited by Nicholas Wainwright. Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1967.

Loudon, John Claudius. *On Laying Out, Planting and Managing of Cemeteries and on the Improvement of Churchyards.* 1843. Reprint, with introduction by James Stevens Curl. Surrey, England: Invelet Books Limited, 1981.

A Picture of Philadelphia, or, A Brief Account of the Various Institutions and Public Objects in this Metropolis. Philadelphia: E. L. Carey and A. Hart, 1835.

The Manufactories and Manufacturers of Pennsylvania of the Nineteenth Century. Philadelphia: Galaxy Publishing Co., 1875.

Rules and Regulations of the Laurel Hill Cemetery of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: n.p., 1872. See also 1879 and 1892 eds.

[Smith, John Jay]. *Regulations of the Laurel Hill Cemetery, on the River Schuylkill, Near Philadelphia.* Philadelphia: A. Waldie, 1837. See also later editions.

[_____]. *Statues of Old Mortality and His Pony, and of Sir Walter Scott.* Philadelphia: A. Waldie, 1838.

[_____]. *Guide to Laurel Hill Cemetery, Near Philadelphia.* Philadelphia: C. Sherman, 1844. See also later editions.

_____. *Designs for Monuments and Mural Tablets: Adapted to Rural Cemeteries, Churches, Church Yards and Chapels.* New York: Bartlett and Welford, 1846.

_____, and Thomas U. Walter. *A Guide to Workers in Metals and Stone.* Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1846.

_____, and Thomas U. Walter. *Two Hundred Designs for Cottages and Villas.* Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1846.

_____, and John F. Watson. *American Historical and Literary Curiosities; Consisting of Fac-Similies of Original Documents Relating to the Events of the Revolution, &c., &c., with a Variety of Reliques, Antiquities, and Modern Autographs.* Philadelphia: National Publishing Co., 1847. Revised and reprinted 1860, 1861.

_____. *Recollections of John Jay Smith.* Edited by Elizabeth P. Smith. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1892.

R. A. Smith. *Philadelphia as It Is, in 1852.* Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1852.

_____. *Smith's Illustrated Guide to and through Laurel Hill Cemetery.* Philadelphia: Willis P. Hazard, 1852.

Strahan, Edward (Earl Shinn). *A Century After: Picturesque Glimpses of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania Including Fairmount, the Wissahickon, and other Romantic Localities, with the Cities and Landscapes of the State.* Philadelphia: Allen, Lane & Scott and J. W. Lauderbach, 1875.

The Stranger's Guide in Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1861.

Taylor, Frank H. *The Valley of the Schuylkill and Its Attractions.* Philadelphia: Jas. W. Nagle, 1878.

Views of American Cities. New York: Goupil, Vibert & Co., 1848-51.

Wild, J. C., and J. R. Chevalier. *Views of Philadelphia and Its Vicinity.* Philadelphia, 1838.

Secondary Sources, Unpublished

Theses, Reports and Miscellaneous Manuscripts

Ali, Maria F. "Fairmount Park." Historic American Buildings Survey PA-6183. 1995.

Engle, Reed Laurence, and Constance M. Greiff. "Historic Structure Report: Laurel Hill Cemetery, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania." TD. Commissioned by the Friends of Laurel Hill from John M. Dickey, A.I.A., 1979. Laurel Hill Cemetery Company.

Fox, Pamela W. "National Register of Historic Places Nomination: West Laurel Hill Cemetery." 1991.

Lewis, Michael J. "Who Designed Fairmount Park?," 1998, TMs [photocopy]. Collection of the author.

Long, Timothy Preston. "The Woodlands: a 'Matchless Place.'" M.S. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1991.

Moak, Jefferson M. "James Charles Sidney: Works," 1987, TMs. City Archives, Philadelphia.

Morgan, Keith. "The Landscape Gardening of John Notman, 1810-1865." M.A. thesis, University of Delaware, Winterthur Program in Early American Culture, 1973.

Robbins, Owen Tasker. "Toward a Preservation of the Grounds of Lemon Hill in Light of Their Past and Present Significance for Philadelphians." M.S. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1987.

Smith, Jane Snyder. "National Register of Historic Places Nomination: Laurel Hill Cemetery." 1976.

Wunsch, Aaron V. "Schuylkill River Villas." Historic American Buildings Survey no. PA-6184. 1995.

_____. "Lemon Hill." Historic American Buildings Survey no. PA-1010. 1995.

Secondary Sources, Published

Articles

Ames, Kenneth. " Ideologies in Stone: Meanings in Victorian Gravestones." *Journal of*

Popular Culture 14, no. 4 (Spring 1981): 641-56.

Bender, Thomas. "The 'Rural' Cemetery Movement: Urban Travail and the Appeal of Nature." *New England Quarterly* 47 (June 1974): 196-211.

Conzen, Michael P. "The County Landownership Map in America: Its Commercial Development and Social Transformation 1814-1939." *Imago Mundi* 36 (1984): 9-31.

Curl, James Stevens. "The Architecture and Planning of the Nineteenth-century Cemetery." *Garden History: the Journal of the Garden History Society*, 3, no. 3 (Summer 1975): 13-41.

_____. "The Design of Early British Cemeteries." *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (July - September 1984): 223-254.

Darnall, Margaretta J. "The American Cemetery as Picturesque Landscape: Bellefontaine Cemetery, St. Louis." *Winterthur Portfolio*, 18 (1983): 249-69.

Etlin, Richard. "Landscapes of Eternity: Funerary Architecture and the Cemetery, 1793-1881." *Oppositions* 8 (Spring 1977): 14-31.

_____. "The Geometry of Death." *Progressive Architecture* 5 (May 1982): 134-37.

_____. "Pere Lachaise and the Garden Cemetery," *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (July - September 1984): 211-22.

French, Stanley. "The Cemetery as Cultural Institution: The Establishment of Mount Auburn and the Rural Cemetery Movement." *American Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (March 1974): 37-59.

Jackson, John Brinckerhoff. "The American Public Space." *Public Interest* 74 (Winter, 1984): 52-65.

Koke, Richard J. "James Thom and the Washington Monument: A Scotsman on the Nyack Turnpike in the 1840's." *South of the Mountains: The Historical Society of Rockland County [NY]* 42, nos. 1 & 2 (January-June 1998): 3-23.

Lapsansky, Emma J. "Patriotism, Values and Continuity: Museum Collecting and 'Connectedness.'" *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 114, no. 1 (January 1990): 67-82.

Linden-Ward, Blanche. "Putting the Past in Place: The Making of Mount Auburn Cemetery." *Cambridge Historical Society Proceedings* 44 (1976-79): 171-96.

_____. "Death and the Garden: the Cult of the Melancholy and the 'Rural Cemetery.'" Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1981.

_____. "Putting the Past Under Grass: History as Death and Cemetery Commemoration." *Prospects* (Annual of American Cultural Studies) 10 (1985): 279-314.

_____, and David Sloane. "Spring Grove: the Founding of Cincinnati's Rural Cemetery, 1845-55," *Queen City Heritage* 43, no. 1 (Spring 1985): 17-32.

_____, and Alan Ward. "Spring Grove: The Role of the Rural Cemetery in American Landscape Design." *Landscape Architecture* (September-October 1985): 126-31, 140.

MacNamara, Charles. "City of the Dead." *Philadelphia Magazine* 62, no. 11 (November 1971): 108-115.

Moak, Jefferson M. "Chestnut Hill's Architectural Heritage: James C. Sidney, Architect." *Chestnut Hill Historical Society* [Newsletter], (Summer 1983).

McDannell, Colleen. "The Religious Symbolism of Laurel Hill Cemetery." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 111, no. 3 (July 1987): 275-303.

Nash, Gary B. "Behind the Velvet Curtain: Academic History, Historical Societies and the Presentation of the Past." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 114, no. 1 (January 1990): 3-36.

Penny, N. B. "The Commercial Garden Necropolis of the Early Nineteenth Century and Its Critics." *Garden History: the Journal of the Garden History Society* 2, no. 3 (Summer 1974): 61-76.

Quinn, Jim. "The Resurrection of Laurel Hill." *Philadelphia Magazine* 69, no. 9 (September 1978): 174-76, 224-30.

Remes, Naomi. "The Rural Cemetery." *Nineteenth Century* 5 (Winter 1975): 52-55.

Ristow, Walter W. "The Map Publishing Career of Robert Pearsall Smith." *Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress* 26, no. 3 (July 1969): 170-96.

Rotundo, Barbara. "The Rural Cemetery Movement." *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 109, no. 3 (July 1973): 231-40.

_____. "Mount Auburn Cemetery: A Proper Boston Institution," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 22, no. 3 (July 1974): 268-79.

_____. "Mount Auburn: Fortunate Coincidences and an Ideal Solution," *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (July-September 1984): 255-67.

Schuyler, David. "The Evolution of the Anglo-American Rural Cemetery: Landscape Architecture as Social and Cultural History." *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (July-September 1984): 291-304.

Smith, Barbara Clark. "The Authority of History: The Changing Public Face of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 114, no. 1 (January 1990): 37-66.

Stannard, David E. "Calm Dwellings: The Brief, Sentimental Age of the Rural Cemetery." *American Heritage* 30, no. 5 (August - September 1979): 43-55.

Tatum, George B. "The Beautiful and the Picturesque." *American Quarterly* 3, no. 1 (Spring, 1951): 36-51.

_____. "The Emergence of an American School of Landscape Design." *Historic Preservation*, 25 (April-June 1973): 34-41.

Torchia, Robert W. "No Strangers to the Ravages of Death: John Neagle's Portrait of Dr. John Abraham Elkinton," *Nineteenth Century* 18, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 12-19.

Wodehouse, Lawrence. "John McArthur, Jr. (1823-1890)." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 28, no. 4 (December 1969): 271-83.

Wolfe, Kevin. "Visible City." *Metropolis* (September 1985): 44-50.

Zuk, Judith. "Laurel Hill Cemetery." *The Green Scene* 9, no. 5 (May 1981): 18-21.

Zukowsky, John. "Monumental American Obelisks: Centennial Vistas." *Art Bulletin* 58, no. 4 (December 1976): 574-81.

Books and Chapters

Ariaes, Phillipe. *Death in America*. Edited by David E. Stannard. Philadelphia:

University of Pennsylvania, 1974.

Baltzell, E. Digby. *Philadelphia Gentleman: The Making of A National Upper Class.* New York: The Free Press, 1958.

Bender, Thomas. *Toward an Urban Vision: Ideas and Institutions in Nineteenth Century America.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.

The Biographical Encyclopaedia of Pennsylvania of the Nineteenth Century. Philadelphia: Galaxy Publishing Co., 1874.

Birnbaum, Charles A. et al., eds. *Pioneers of American Landscape Design: An Annotated Bibliography.* Washington: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1993, 1995.

Catterall, Louise F., and Mary Wingfield Scott. *Virginia's Capitol Square.* Richmond: The Valentine Museum, 1957.

Bridenbaugh, Carl and Jessica. *Rebels and Gentlemen: Philadelphia in the Age of Franklin.* New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1942.

Chadwick, George F. *The Park and the Town: Public Landscape in the 19th and 20th Centuries.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966.

Cohen, Jeffrey A. "William Struthers, 1812-1876." Entry in James F. O'Gorman and others, *Drawing Toward Building: Philadelphia Architectural Graphics, 1732-1986.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

Curl, James Stevens. *The Victorian Celebration of Death.* Detroit: Partridge Press, 1972.

_____. *A Celebration of Death: An Introduction to Some of the Buildings, Monuments and Settings of Funerary Architecture in the Western European Tradition.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1980.

Etlin, Richard. *The Architecture of Death: The Transformation of the Cemetery in Eighteenth-Century Paris.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1984.

Farrell, James J. *Inventing the American Way of Death, 1830-1920.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1980.

Foster, Kathleen A. *Captain Watson's Travels in America: The Sketchbooks and Diary of Joshua Rowley Watson, 1772-1818.* With commentaries on the plates by Kenneth Finkel. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.

Frick, George F. "The Library Company of Philadelphia: America's First Philosophical Society." Chap in *Shaping a National Culture: The Philadelphia Experience,* 1750-1800," ed. Catherine E. Hutchins, 181-200. Winterthur [DE]: Winterthur Museum, 1994.

Frost, J. William. "Years of Crisis and Separation: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1790-1860." Chap in *Friends in the Delaware Valley: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting 1681-1981*, ed. John M. Moore. Haverford [PA]: Friends Historical Association, 1981.

Gerlach-Spriggs, Nancy, Richard Enoch Kaufman, and Sam Bass Warner, Jr. *Restorative Gardens: The Healing Landscape.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Gillon, Edmund V., Jr. *Victorian Cemetery Art.* New York: Dover, 1972.

Greiff, Constance M. *John Notman, Architect.* Philadelphia: Athenaeum of Philadelphia, 1979.

Harris, Neil. *The Artist in American Society: The Formative Years, 1790-1860.* New York: George Braziller, 1966.

Hart, Sidney, and David C. Ward. "The Waning of an Enlightenment Ideal: Charles Wilson Peale's Philadelphia Museum, 1790-1820." Chap. in *New Perspectives on Charles Wilson Peale*, ed. Lillian B. Miller and David C. Ward. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1991.

Hedrick, U. P. *A History of Horticulture in America to 1860.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Huth, Hans. *Nature and the American: Three Centuries of Changing Attitudes.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957.

Jackson, Charles O., ed. *Passing: The Vision of Death in America.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1977.

Jackson, Donald C. "Roads Most Traveled: Turnpikes in Southeastern Pennsylvania in the Early Republic." Chap. in *Early American Technology: Making and Doing Things from the Colonial Era to 1850*, ed. Judith A. McGaw. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.

Jackson, Kenneth T., and Camilo Jose Vergara. *Silent Cities: The Evolution of the American Cemetery.* New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1989.

Kasson, John F. *Civilizing the Machine: Technology and Republican Values in America 1776-1900.* New York: Grossman Publishers, 1976.

Linden, Blanche M. G. *Nature By Design: A Sesquicentennial History of Cincinnati's Spring Grove Cemetery.* Cincinnati: Cincinnati Historical Society, 1995.

Linden-Ward, Blanche. *Silent City on a Hill: Landscapes of Memory and Boston's Mount Auburn Cemetery.* Columbus: Ohio State University, 1989.

_____. "Strange but Genteel Pleasure Grounds: Tourist and Leisure Uses of Nineteenth-Century Rural Cemeteries." Chap. in *Cemeteries and Gravemarkers: Voices in American Culture.* Edited by Richard E. Meyer. Logan [UT]: Utah State University Press, 1992.

Maccubbin, Robert P., and Peter Martin, eds. *British and American Gardens in the Eighteenth Century.* Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1984.

Marion, John Francis. *Famous and Curious Cemeteries: a Pictorial, Historical, and Anecdotal View of American and European Cemeteries and the Famous and Infamous People Who Are Buried There.* New York: Crown Publishers, 1977.

Marshall, Gordon M., III. "James Ronaldson." Entry in *Philadelphia: Three Centuries of American Art.* Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1976.

McDowell, Peggy and Richard E. Meyer. *The Revival Styles in American Memorial Art.* Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University, 1992.

Meyer, Richard, E. *Ethnicity and the American Cemetery.* Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University, 1992.

Mitchell, Mary H. *Hollywood Cemetery: The History of a Southern Shrine.* Richmond: Virginia State Library, 1985.

Mitford, Jessica. *The American Way of Death.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963.

Morely, John. *Death, Heaven and the Victorians.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1971.

Moss, Roger W. *The American Country House.* New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1990.

_____, and Sandra L. Tatman. *Biographical Dictionary of Philadelphia Architects: 1700-1930.* Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1985.

Mundy, James H., and Earle G. Shettleworth. *The Flight of the Grand Eagle: Charles G. Bryant, Maine Architect and Adventurer*. Augusta: Maine Historic Preservation Commission, 1977.

O'Malley, Therese. "Landscape Gardening in the Early National Period." In *Views and Visions: American Landscape before 1830*, ed. Edward J. Nygren and Bruce Robertson, 133-59. Washington: Corcoran Gallery of Art, 1986.

_____. "Charles Wilson Peale's Belfield." Chap in *New Perspectives on Charles Wilson Peale*, ed. Lillian B. Miller and David C. Ward, 267-82. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1991.

Perloff, Carl Beneson. *The Asylum*. Philadelphia: Friends Hospital, 1994.

Pike, Martha and Janice Gray. *A Time to Mourn: Expressions of Grief in Nineteenth-Century America*. Stony Brook, N.Y.: The Museums at Stony Brook, 1980.

Pregill, Philip and Nancy Volkman. *Landscapes in History: Design and Planning in the Western Tradition*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1993.

Ragon, Michel. *The Space of Death: a Study of Funerary Architecture, Decoration and Urbanism*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1983.

Reps, John W. *The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Rothman, David J. *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971.

Scharf, J. Thomas, and Thompson Westcott. *History of Philadelphia, 1609-1884*. Philadelphia: L. H. Everts & Co., 1884.

Schuyler, David. *The New Urban Landscape: The Redefinition of City Form in Nineteenth-Century America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

_____. *Apostle of Taste: Andrew Jackson Downing, 1815-1852*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Sears, John F. *Sacred Places: American Tourist Attractions in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Sellars, Charles Coleman. "Peale's Museum." Chap. in *Historic Philadelphia, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 43, no. 1 (1953).

Simpson, Henry. *The Lives of Eminent Philadelphians, Now Deceased.* Philadelphia: William Brotherhead, 1859.

Sloane, David C. *The Last Great Necessity: Cemeteries in American History.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Stanton, Phoebe. *The Gothic Revival and American Church Architecture.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1968.

Tatum, George B. *Penn's Great Town: 250 Years of Philadelphia Architecture Illustrated in Prints and Drawings.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961.

Thomas, George. "The Statue in the Garden." Chap. in *Sculpture of a City: Philadelphia's Treasures in Bronze and Stone.* New York: Walker Publishing Co., 1974.

Upton, Dell. "The Urban Cemetery and the Urban Community: The Origin of the New Orleans Cemetery." In *Exploring Everyday Landscapes: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* 7, eds. Annmarie Adams and Sally McMurry, 131-45. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

Wainwright, Nicholas B. *Philadelphia in the Romantic Age of Lithography.* Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1958.

_____. "The Age of Nicholas Biddle, 1825-1841." Chap in *Philadelphia: A 300 Year History*, ed. Russell F. Weigley et al. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1982.

Warner, Sam Bass, Jr. *The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of Its Growth.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968.

Watson, John F. *Annals of Philadelphia, and Pennsylvania, in the Olden Time.* Philadelphia: John Pennington and Uriah Hunt, 1844; revised edition, ed. Willis P. Hazard. Philadelphia: Leary, Stuart Co., 1927.

Webster, Richard J. *Philadelphia Preserved.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976.

White, Theo B., ed. *Philadelphia Architecture in the Nineteenth Century.* Philadelphia:

University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953.

Wolf, Edwin II, ed. *The Library of James Logan of Philadelphia, 1674-1751.* Philadelphia: Library Company of Philadelphia, 1974.

F. Likely Sources Not Yet Investigated:

The most significant uninvestigated source is John Jay Smith's "Memoranda Respecting the Foundation of Laurel Hill Cemetery." This contained Smith's account of his institution's early years and many relevant newspaper clippings. Until the late 1970s, researchers viewed the Memoranda in the collection of Jane and Drayton Smith, Paoli, Pennsylvania. Perhaps the document will resurface there at some point.

ADDENDUM TO
LAUREL HILL CEMETERY
3822 Ridge Road, Fairmount Park
Philadelphia
Philadelphia County
Pennsylvania

HABS No. PA-1811

HABS
PA
51-PHILA,
100-

PHOTOGRAPHS

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of Interior
1849 C Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20240

ADDENDUM TO:
LAUREL HILL CEMETERY
Fairmount Park
3822 Ridge Avenue
Philadelphia
Philadelphia County
Pennsylvania

HABS PA-1811
PA,51-PHILA,100-

PHOTOGRAPHS

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240-0001